This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B 441250

1837
ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BX
8201
.M59

14889

# METHODIST

# QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## 1878.

VOLUME LX.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXX.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1878.

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME LX.—1878.

## JANUARY NUMBER.


PAGE

ISLAM ..... 5
Rev. T. J. Scott, D.D., India.

CITY METHODISM ..... 27
H. K. Carroll, Esq., Religious Editor of the Independent.

EDUCATION AMONG THE FREEDMEN ..... 43
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

THE BLUE LAW FORGERIES OF REV. SAMUEL PETERS ..... 67
William L. Kingsley, Esq., New Haven, Conn.

WAS WESLEY ORDAINED A BISHOP BY ERASMUS? ..... 88
Rev. George A. Phoebus, D.D., Newark, Del.

BISHOP BAKER ..... 111
Rev. Charles Adams, D.D., Washington, D. C.

PHILO, THE JEW, [First Paper.] ..... 121
Prof. James H. Worman, of Rockland Institute, Nyack, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies ..... 141
Foreign Religious Intelligence ..... 163
Foreign Literary Intelligence ..... 168
Quarterly Book-Table ..... 170
Wesley as a Greek Bishop? ..... 195


## APRIL NUMBER.


EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY. [First Paper.] ..... 197
James Strong, S.T.D., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

OUR SOUTHERN FIELD ..... 219
Rev. E. Q. Fuller, D.D., Atlanta, Ga.

SILENCE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCHES ..... 238
Rev. S. L. Bowman, D.D., York, Pa.

SOME PHASES OF THE CHINESE PROBLEM ..... 268
Rev. E. S. Todd, A.M., San Francisco, Cal.

THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN POLITICS ..... 291
Rev. J. F. Richmond, New York.

METHODIST STATISTICS ..... 311
Rev. W. H. De Puy, D.D., Assistant Editor of "Christian Advocate," New York.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies ..... 327
Foreign Religious Intelligence ..... 347
Foreign Literary Intelligence ..... 351
Quarterly Book-Table ..... 354

## JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

THE DOCTRINES AND DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH ..... 389
Rev. E. O. Haven, D.D., Chancellor of Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

MYSTICISM ..... 412
Prof. James E. Latimer, Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

SCHLIEMANN'S TROJAN RESEARCHES ..... 426
Prof. Henry M. Baird, D.D., University of the City of New York.

CASE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES ..... 443
Rev. Edward Barrass, Hampton, Ontario, Canada.

EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY. [Second Paper.] ..... 462
Prof. James Strong, S.T.D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

BIBLE WINES ..... 480
Rev. Prof. F. D. Hemenway, D.D., Evanston, Ill.

TYERMAN'S LIFE OF WHITEFIELD ..... 491
Rev. J. L. Boswell, Bound Brook, N. J.

THE "ATONEMENT" OF THE EARLY CHURCH NO PRICE PAID TO SATAN ..... 504
Prof. Henry C. Sheldon, Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies ..... 525

Foreign Religious Intelligence ..... 547

Foreign Literary Intelligence ..... 555

Quarterly Book-Table ..... 556

## OCTOBER NUMBER.

MADAME DE STAËL'S "GERMANY" ..... 581
Abel Stevens, LL.D., Switzerland.

TAYLER LEWIS: IN MEMORIAM ..... 604
Prof. William Wells, LL.D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

THE NEW ETHICS ..... 631
Prof. Lacroix, Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio.

PLAGIARISM AND THE LAW OF QUOTATION ..... 647
Rev. Henry J. Fox, D.D., Hyde Park, Mass.

DANIEL WEBSTER ..... 659
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION AND THE HIGHER LIFE ..... 688
Rev. J. Townley Crane, D.D., Port Jervis, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies ..... 715

Foreign Religious Intelligence ..... 734

Quarterly Book-Table ..... 738

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1878.


## ART. I.—ISLAM.

RELIGIOUS toleration is a virtue, brightening into greater excellence in later generations. It is one of the hopeful signs of the age that the bigotry that could formerly find no trace of the heavenly Father's love and guidance in the history and literature of non-Christian peoples, is giving place to a recognition of the fact that God has not left himself without witness in any nation; and that, while the dispensation of non-Christian peoples has no glory compared with the glory that excelleth in the kingdom of heaven, still a dispensation admitting of salvation they have had—a dispensation of the Spirit, and of the broken light of tradition, with scattered fragments of God's revealed word. All in their religious systems is not irredeemably bad. But when this spirit of toleration degenerates into a sickly sentimentalism that elevates Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Mohammedanism into a brotherhood of religions coordinate with Christianity, and makes Buddha and Manu and Mohammed almost, if not quite, equal to Jesus, it is time that we seek a wholesome reaction against this spirit of extreme liberality.

Mohammedanism has come in for its full share of exaltation. We have from the pen of an Englishman, Mr. Davenport, "An Apology for Mohammed and the Koran,"* followed by

* Davy & Sons. London. 1869.

a Moslem author, Syed Ahmed Khan of India, in "Essays on the Life of Mohammed,"* intended as an apology for English readers, and claiming Islam to be a benefactor of the race and of the "Christian dispensation!" Then comes R. Bosworth Smith with "Mohammed and Mohammedanism,"† boldly claiming that "among the moral teachers of the world Mohammed occupies the most historic position. He is pre-eminently the last of the prophets." At the time this audacious defense was being written, another Moslem author was also writing in England, "A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed."‡ With more boldness than "critical" ability, he bravely claims that the unsuccessful siege of Constantinople by the Moslems in the eighth century, and their defeat in France by Charles Martel in the same century, were two great calamities "which materially retarded the progress of the world, and put back the hour-hand of time for centuries." Professor J. W. Draper also makes Mohammed a "messenger of God" to our race.§ Here we have liberality of the broadest type. Mr. Davenport tells us that Mohammed must "undoubtedly be acknowledged as the very greatest man whom Asia can call her son, if not one of the rarest and most transcendent geniuses the world ever produced." His entire book is a defense of the Koran and its author. Bosworth Smith writes:—

> The two great religions which started from kindred soil, the one from Mecca, the other from Jerusalem, might work on in their respective spheres, the one the religion of progress, the other of stability; the one of complex life, the other of simple life; the one dwelling more upon the inherent weakness of human nature, the other on its inherent dignity . . . each rejoicing in the success of the other, each supplying the other's wants in a generous rivalry for the common good of humanity.—P. 232.

Thus would our authors elevate Islam to the dignity of co-partnership with the religion of Him who said, "I am the light of the world;" "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "Come unto *me*, *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden." Smith writes of Mohammed that "compared with the long

* Trübner & Co. London. 1870. † William & Norgate. London. 1873.
‡ Smith, Elder, & Co. London. 1874.
§ "Intellectual Development of Europe." Harper & Bros. New York. 1863.

roll of great men whom the world by common consent has called great . . . take him all in what he was and what he did, and what those inspired by him have done, he seems to me to stand alone above and beyond them all." "If ever any man had a right to say he ruled by right divine, it was Mohammed." "Christianity will one day, I venture to believe, agree in yielding to him that (title) of a prophet, a very prophet of God." "In my opinion he comes next to him (Jesus) in the long roll of the great benefactors of the race." Thus the son of Abdoola is elevated to a place by the Son of God! Bigotry and intolerance of the narrowest type are much less dangerous to truth than this. Well may we raise the inquiry, In what degree is Islam and its founder worthy of so great praise? Are we to look upon Islam as the "best ally" of Christianity, and yield "homage to the noble sincerity" of Mohammed? When men like the Rev. Professor Blyden, of Liberia, are carried away by the specious writing of these latitudinarians, and seem to see in Islam innumerable blessings for Africa, it is time we have a re-examination and restatement of this subject.* The attempt must be made in fairness, with a charity that would think no evil, and yet undeterred by the cry of bigotry and intolerance. "Truth is above all men."

Two lines of brief inquiry are before us: First. What is the moral character of Mohammedanism? Second. What are its effects on the world?

I. The first line of inquiry we confine to two points: first, the founder of the system; second, his book. The founder of a system of religion or philosophy and his book become alternatively each a means of interpreting the other. The man is often an explanation of his system and the system of the man.

Mohammed, son of Abdoola, a prince of the tribe of Koreish, was born at Mecca, in Arabia, A. D. 570 or 571. The *Hayat ul Kuloob*, a Persian life of Mohammed, describes him as above medium height, with broad chest and good figure; head large, with long hair parted in the middle, nose aquiline. A line of fine black hair extended down his chest. He walked with a slight stoop, and looked from the corners of

* See Article "Mohammedanism and the Negro Race" in this Quarterly for January, 1877.

his eyes. He went in trading expeditions into Syria, and was thus brought in contact with Jews and Christians. Many of these, indeed, resided in Northern Arabia, and thus Mohammed found opportunity to become, in some degree, acquainted with their history, traditions, and doctrines. He was uneducated, but manifestly a man of superior genius, of quiet, thoughtful, cunning observation, and capacious memory. His intercourse with the Jews and Christians impressed him with the superiority of their belief over the fetichism and idolatry of the desert tribes. It is difficult to estimate the factors that contributed to the formation of his remarkable character. The Koran testifies to his partial knowledge of the sacred Scriptures; also to his more extended acquaintance with the traditions and fables of the Jews and early Christians. The effects of Zoroastrianism also appears. Mohammed early won the title "*Al Ameen*," the faithful. It is just, perhaps, to suppose that he really meditated the moral improvement of his people, yet an impartial estimate of his entire life compels the conclusion that from a simple life and laudable purpose there was an awful descent to a life of ambition, deception, and lust. Some of the earlier writers, as Prideaux, Maracci, and White, were, perhaps, too sweeping in their estimate of his entire life. Still it must be noted that while later writers, Sprenger, Muir, Rodwell, and others, admit that there seems to have been something amiable and noble in his earlier years, afterward the life of Mohammed reveals the great deceiver consciously fabricating a system of religion as direct from God—at first peaceably, and then by the sword.

Sprenger says Mohammed's character was deeply marked by "cunning," and that one of his most distinguishing characteristics was "dark and bloody fanaticism." Foster says, "His personal habits were grossly sensual, and became worse as he advanced in years and hardened in the latitude of successful imposture." Muir says, "The heart of Mohammed was vindictive and revengeful—ambition, rapine, and assassination are the undenied features of his later life. . . . Mohammed deliberately yielded to a compromise with evil." Bosworth Smith admits Muir to be an impartial writer, and this is his opinion of Smith's hero. The first of a new series of works on Islam is

recently out by Major Osborn, of Her Majesty's Indian Army.* The author, a liberal thinker, seems to be going over the ground with great fairness. "There are," he writes, "modern biographers of the prophet who would have us believe that he was not conscious of falsehood. He was under a hallucination, of course, but he believed what he said. This to me is incredible. Mohammed was guilty of falsehood under circumstances where he deemed the end justified the means." Fortunately the historical materials clustering round this subject have been so closely scrutinized and so thoroughly sifted that we are pretty sure now of the "naked facts." Moreover, able translations of the Koran lay bare the workings of its author's mind. Did our space admit, quotations would amply illustrate each point presented. A few references, direct and indirect, must suffice.

*Mohammed was a great deceiver.*—He is guilty, as Muir affirms, of the "high blasphemy of forging the name of God." This was, without doubt, deliberate, studied, persistent. He boldly assumed the position before the world of one in direct communication with God, from whom he received verbal messages.† His constant reiteration in the Koran of the inspiration of his messages, betrays anxiety to maintain his prophetic character—betrays consciousness of fraud. Truth and honesty are calm and self-possessed. The Koran is largely made up of legends, as already mentioned. These are artfully worked up, and presented as direct revelations of historic fact. It is the work of a mountebank to get the fact and then pretend supernatural information. (See Sale's Koran, chaps. xii and xxxviii.) The messages were given during a period of twenty-three years, and just as suited the varying fortunes of the prophet. The emergency never failed to bring a message; and as the circumstances of the prophet changed greatly during his career, we might expect change and confliction in the import of the messages. Such there was, and some of the faithful were tempted to mistrust Mohammed. A revelation was at hand for this emergency also: "Whatever verse we shall abrogate or cause thee to forget, we will bring a better than it" (chap. ii.)‡ Moslem doctors admit that there are some two hundred and

* "Islam Under the Arabs." London: Longman's, Green, & Co. 1876.

† Muir suggests the possibility of satanic inspiration.

‡ Sale's "Translations of the Koran" is always referred to in this article.

twenty-five verses that are thus abrogated, and among these in the attempt at consistency we have the singular inadvertence of an earlier verse abrogating a later. To illustrate this subject of conflicting messages, at one time Moslems were directed to pray toward Jerusalem. This was to interest the Jews; but this obstinate people, resisting the claims of the prophet, a counter message required the faithful to pray toward Mecca. In his earlier career, when his followers were few and weak, Mohammed's messages were all peaceable. "Verily thou art a preacher," Gabriel often whispers to him; but after the *hegira*, or flight from Mecca to Medina, when numbers began to trust him, and an army became a thing possible, messages of a warlike character began to descend, and the meek Moslems became the fierce Saracen hordes that swept the world in a tornado of fire and blood. In the Mecca messages all is conciliation, patience, peace; in the Medina messages it is "war to the knife." These passages abound: "Fight, therefore, for the religion of God." "Strike off their heads." "Fight against them till there be no opposition."

The facility with which Mohammed found messages to defend his own conduct when questioned betrays the conscious deceiver. To illustrate, the polygamy that he sanctioned for all time in his system by pretended revelation, became to him a snare and perplexity. But Gabriel's message always solved the difficulty, and justified him before his scandalized followers. Did he, in his anxious proclivities, surround himself with more wives than the legal four allowed the faithful, an opportune message from Gabriel gave him unlimited privilege, (chapter xxxiii.) Did his coveting the wife of his adopted son ensnare him, a message justifies the whole affair. Did his aberrations with beautiful slaves lead to a domestic embroglio in the well-filled harem, a message quiets all and gives him a dispensation of lust, (chap. lxvi.) It is of this man Smith writes, he had "unfaltering belief in his own inspiration to the last." By facts like these his sincerity must be judged.

*Mohammed was guilty of Assassinations.*—Muir says, "Ambition, rapine, assassination, are the undenied features of his life." Syed Ameer Ali, in his Life of Mohammed, makes a very weak attempt at a blinding diversion, in commenting on the bloody work of his prophet, by referring to the "tortures

of the rack and stake which destroyed myriads of innocent beings in Christian Europe." But the Prophet of Nazareth never sanctioned such work. Mohammed did sanction the destruction of "innocent beings," and was the author of several foul assassinations: his first victim, Asma, a woman who had written satirical verses about him. "Who will rid me of this woman?" he asked. Omeir heard the question, and bathed his scimiter in the blood of Asma as she slept in the midst of her children. "See a man who hath assisted the Lord and his prophet," Mohammed said the next day in the mosque. Another victim was an old Jew, whose life was the forfeit, in the dead of night, for having ridiculed the prophet. A third victim was Kab, another Jew, who was, by the order of Mohammed, enticed to a lonely spot and hewn to pieces. The Jews, by their stubbornness and superior intelligence, were enemies not to be endured, and after this last murder the faithful received a *carte-blanché* to slay the Jews at will. Muir says, "The butchery of the Coreitza (a Jewish tribe) leaves a dark stain of infamy on the character of Mohammed." Arnold, favorable in many respects to his character, says, "he had recourse to the base and treacherous measure of attacking the Koreshites (an Arab tribe) during the sacred months," when they could not defend themselves. These things are too much for even Bosworth Smith; but he lightly passes them by as "one or two acts of summary, uncompromising punishment, possibly, one or two acts of cunning." By this record of blood Mohammed must be tried.

*During the years of his assumed prophetic office the life of Mohammed was marked by the grossest polygamy and lust.*— He sanctioned polygamy and lust by his pretended revelations, and then availing himself of the largest license of his system, lust became at once the result and the cause of his depravity. He began by limiting the wives of the faithful to four, with the unlimited use of female slaves and captives. But for himself he added wife to wife till he had passed the legal four and presided over a harem of fifteen or more wives, to whom slaves and concubines were added. As we have seen, the lawlessness of his own life, in view of his restrictions for others, scandalized his followers, but their misgivings were quieted by fresh revelations, which left the prophet, by special dispensa-

tion, in possession of the largest liberty. "O prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee, and any believing woman if she give herself to the prophet" (chap. xxxiii.) Even for that loose age and people there were irregularities in the way Mohammed took some of his wives that were too much for the faithful; but, as we have seen in the case of Zaid's wife, Gabriel was at hand with his message of justification. "We joined her in marriage unto thee—no crime is to be charged to the prophet as to what God hath allowed" (chap. xxxiii.) Surrounded by many wives, he indulged a still wider license, which embroiled him in many a conjugal commotion. Mariam, a Coptic slave, sent him by Mokawkas, governor of Egypt, was a great cause of disturbance in the prophet's harem, and his relation to her is justified in chap. lxvi of the Koran. There are stories, and comments, and artless explanations in Moslem writers relating to these matters too vile to be transferred to these pages.

When the liberality of some, in this liberal day, would clothe this man with the authority of a veritable "prophet of God," these facts must be reviewed. No stretch of charity can cover up the deception, unscrupulousness, blood-guiltiness, and lust here revealed. No theory of honesty or self-deception can be maintained. Mohammed attempted to screen himself in this wickedness "by the high blasphemy of forging the name of God." One who has carefully studied this subject writes: "We readily admit that bad men have sometimes been, like Balaam and others, the divinely-appointed organs of inspiration; but in the case of Mohammed, his professed inspiration sanctioned and encouraged his own vices. That which ought to have been the fountain of purity was, in fact, the cover of the prophet's depravity."*

From Mohammed we turn to the Koran. As intimated, they mutually explain each other. From the Koran, too, we are justified in drawing *à priori* inference as to the probable effects of Islam on the world. A book that molds the faith and life of one hundred and fifty millions of souls deserves our study. Mohammed was forty years old when his revelations began,

* "Notes on Mohammedanism." By the Rev. T. P. HUGHES, Missionary to the Afghans. London: Allen & Co. 1875.

and they were continued for twenty-three years. He claimed that Gabriel brought *verbatim* messages. There is, as we have intimated, but little originality in the Koran. The Talmud and apocryphal gospels contribute much to it. The *style* of the Koran has been extravagantly praised by some Moslems, and yet decried by others. It may well be doubted if the charm consists in much beyond rhythmic repetitions and verbal jingling. The matter is not noble and ennobling; but seems infinitely below the Jewish prophetic Scriptures or the Gospels. Gibbon's famous criticism is, that the Koran is "an endless, incoherent rhapsody of fable and precept and declaration, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds." Of later date is the criticism of Dr. Draper, whose review of the Koran Professor Blyden calls "able." We read: "Its most celebrated passages, as those on the nature of God, in chapters ii and xxiv, will bear no comparison with parallel ones in the Psalms and Book of Job." "An impartial reader of the Koran may doubtless be surprised that so feeble a production should serve its purpose so well." "The Koran betrays a human and not very intellectual origin." * But we are seeking for the moral character of this book.

*The Koran lowers the moral character of God.*—It is profuse in declarations of his awful majesty, and his irresistible power, and absolute sovereignty; but we miss the tenderness and divine sympathy of the Psalms and prophets, and especially the soul-winning revelations of the Divine Fatherhood found in the Gospels. In the Koran, God is the irresistible Ruler rather than moral Governor. His Fatherhood is hardly mentioned. One is shocked with the savagery of the descriptions of hell. We have frequent passages running thus: "They shall have garments of fire fitted unto them; their bowels shall be dissolved thereby, and also their skins, and they shall be beaten with maces of iron" (chapter xxii.) "Verily, those who disbelieve in our signs we will surely cast to be broiled in hell fire. So often as their skins shall be burned, we will give them in exchange other skins, that they may taste the sharper torments" (chapter iv.) Brief and terrible gleams of the state of the lost are given in the New Testament, and the curtain drops. Misery there is, but it does not seem to be the work of a fiend.

* "Intellectual Development of Europe," pp. 254, 255.

The descriptions of the Koran are disgusting—hideous. The torments of the damned are simply revolting. One is repelled by the God of this book. His character is not such as to inspire penitence and awaken moral life. He leads men into sin. This is the express import of too many passages, to admit of any explanation other than a sovereign caprice misleading and destroying men without mercy.

*The Koran teaches a fate the most absolute and unqualified.*—This is the sixth article in the Moslem creed. Mohammed made effective use of this doctrine in the Koran. By it his followers are encouraged to desperation and recklessness, in fighting against the unbelievers. Every one familiar with the daily life of Moslems knows how much they are influenced by the idea of fate. It is a solace in trial, a consolation in defeat, a blight to every energy, an excuse for every crime. In India *taqdir* is the ready answer for every act of wickedness.

*The Koran upholds slavery in its worst forms.*—It has not the humane regulations of the Jewish law. By that law if a master killed his slave he was punished. Not so in Islam. The Koran grants unlimited concubinage with female slaves. "Take in marriage of such other women as please you, one, two, or three, or four, and not more, or the slaves which ye have acquired" (chapter iv.) "O, prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, and the slaves that thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee" (chapter xxxiii.) According to the *Haiyat ul Kulul*, Mohammed had thirty-nine slaves, some of these, the gifts of rulers, were his favorite concubines. It is this license of the Koran that renders slavery so popular in all Mohammedan countries. Palgrave, in his "Central and Eastern Arabia," writes of "the universality of concubinage between the master and his female slaves." It is surprising that Professor Blyden, referring to Mr. Freeman's statement that Mohammedanism "has consecrated slavery," puts with equal propriety the remark into the mouth of a Moslem, that "Christianity has consecrated Negro slavery." Slavery is not inherent in the Christian system—it is a consecrated part of Islam. The New Testament does not sanction slavery, the Koran does, and in a most demoralizing form, and Moslem doctors elaborately defend the system.

*The Koran sanctions polygamy.*—It is an atonishing state-

ment of Bosworth Smith, that "it is not fair to represent polygamy as a part of Mohammedanism any more than it is to represent slavery as a part of Christianity."

The New Testament never gives a word of sanction for slavery. The Koran lays down the law for polygamy, (chapter iv,) and Moslem writers defend it on "natural, social, and religious grounds."* True, polygamy existed among the patriarchs, and in the time of the Mosaic economy, and possibly among the early Christian converts from paganism, but we never find the system sanctioned as in the Koran. In keeping with polygamy, it provides for easy and almost unlimited divorce. (Chapters ii, iv, xxiii.)

*The Koran panders to the carnal heart and fosters lust.*—The impartial student of this book cannot resist the conclusion that sensuality is made an element of enticement and power in Islam. Proof of this grave charge is found in what we have presented on the slavery and polygamy of the Koran. Mr. Kennedy, who has lived among the Moslems of India for nearly forty years, writes: "Truth compels us to state facts, which prove that Mohammed has done more, perhaps, than any man who ever lived to degrade woman, and thereby degrade man."† The license of polygamy and slave concubinage is a hot-bed for the growth of unbounded lust. As we have seen, provision is made in the Koran for unlimited divorce. It is impossible to estimate the depraving effects on Islam of this law.

> Wherever marriage is lightly esteemed, there is great danger that every tie will become loose. Unless the law be strong and strict enough to silence and suppress the roving imagination and roving desire, and to settle completely all thought of breaking or overstepping the sacred limit, disorder, licentiousness, and moral anarchy commence. A sensual tone pervades the life. And it is a universal law, that where sexual license prevails, lawlessness of every other kind prevails. Lust and cruelty ever go together."‡

Now the tendency of the Koran is not only *not* to restrain, but it actually *pampers* lust.

The heaven of the Koran panders to the carnal heart. Mr. Smith tries to parry what may be said against "the gross nature

* Syed Ahmad Khan's "Life of Mohammed." Fourth Essay.

† "Christianity and the Religion of India," p. 255.

‡ Whedon on the New Testament, vol. i, p. 224.

of Mohammed's paradise and the blackeyed houris" by insisting that "this is not, in the main, a true, and still less is it an adequate, account of the matter;" but those who have spent long years among Moslems, who know the views of their doctors, and can produce traditions of the prophet himself, showing that he intended a literal meaning for the descriptions of the Koran, may be excused if they continue to believe that Mohammed held out a paradise of carnal pleasure for the faithful. In chapters lv and lvi we find the most complete description of the "beauteous damsels," of "large black eyes," "reposing on couches adorned with gold," while "goblets and beakers of flowing wine" are passed round, all "for the delight of the companions of the right hand." Orthodox Moslem commentators do not hesitate about the literal explanation. The natural evil tendency of such teachings is well illustrated by the lines of a Moslem, *Umr-i-Khayyam*, a celebrated Persian poet, thus:—

> "They tell us of a heavenly garden,
> Where the clear wine will sparkle, and the dark-eyed damsel smile.
> With joys like these hereafter,
> Why not wine and woman now?"

But one more of the many charges that may be made:—

*The Koran is in tone bitter and intolerant, and it inculcates the propagation of Islam by the sword.*—Writers like Professor Blyden are certainly deceived as to the true spirit of Islam, begotten and fostered by the teaching of the Koran, when they describe the tender sympathy of Moslem missionaries, as they gently teach the degraded whom they seek to elevate, entering often into loving wedlock with the newly-won faithful. There must be a reason for the muffled paw of the tiger in West Africa. The spirit of the Koran is, in the main, intolerant, and its legitimate fruit is a fierce fanaticism, in more recent times seen in the Nestorian and Cretan massacres, and in the Bulgarian atrocities. Moslem bigotry and intolerance is forever goading the Christian subjects of Mohammedan rule into desperate rebellion. A writer in the Indian Evangelical Review* catches the spirit of the Koran precisely:—

* Review for October, 1876—"Bombay, India." C. N. Chapin, 1 Somerset-street, Boston.

The most frightful objurgations against Christians, Jews, and Polytheists, Mohammed's enemies, and all who reject the smallest part of his revelations, are to be found in every chapter; while the torments of the damned are described with even greater gusto than the rewards of the faithful. It is pretty certain that if a single Old Testament book contained, in proportion to its length, one fifth of the cursing and bitterness that the Koran does, it would have been used over and over again by the theists as the strongest possible argument against the reception of any part of the Bible.

Apostates from Islam are to be slain without mercy (chap. iv.) Crescentade, or holy war against the infidels, is taught in numerous passages running thus: "Whosoever fighteth for this religion of God we will surely give him a great reward." "Excite the faithful to war." "God hath preferred those who fight for the faith." "Fight against them till there be no opposition and the religion be wholly God's." "When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads until ye have made a great slaughter."

It reveals but small capacity for the task he has undertaken in the defense of Islam when Syed Ameer Ali seeks to compare the "struggles in self-defense" (!!) of Islam with the frightful wars of Jews and Christians for the propagation of their respective faiths." Where in the Old or New Testament are these "frightful wars" inculcated? But the Koran is full of incitement to war for the propagation of Islam. Mohammed himself led some twenty-seven military expeditions. The entire history of Islam is a forcible comment on the passages just quoted. Some Moslem doctors teach that the faithful should never remain subject to infidel rule. The frequent reply of the fierce Moslem disputant to the missionary is, "the proper argument against you is the sword."

Such is the Prophet of Arabia, with his manifold tergiversations and manifest deceptions, with his polygamy and slave concubinage, with his assassinations and blood-guiltiness, till he died in the arms of Ayesha, bitterly cursing the Jews and Christians. Such is his book, with its baneful doctrine of fate, its teachings on slavery and war, its sanction of polygamy and lust. What marvel that the Koran seemed to one of the faithful capable of a double interpretation! Al-Jahedi, a Moslem doctor, insisted that the Koran is a body, which can be turned

into a man or beast. Muir, an Arabic scholar of undoubted reputation, and not open to the regret of Professor Blyden for Bosworth Smith, "that he had not access to the force and beauty of the original," says that even the Arabic, as molded by the system that grew out of the precepts of the Koran, is full of impurities. What if the fabricator of such a book does "guide the daily life of one third * of the human race." Does this, as Dr. Draper suggests, "justify the title of a messenger of God?" Without prejudging the case, we might anticipate that the effects of a religious system originating with such a teacher and inspired by such a book, must be baneful on the world. Here we turn to

II. *The effects of Islam on the World.*

A class of writers, as we have seen, advance Islam to the position of a Godsent religion, fraught with unmingled good to our race, "the generous rival of Christianity for the good of humanity." We have a new era in the discussion of Mohammedanism, and this claim is now emphatically before the bar of the world. In the light of facts it must be judged. If what we have written about Mohammed and the Koran be true, then, *à priori*, we might be certain that Islam founded by a deceiver, perpetuated in fraud, and involving errors fundamental, vicious, and vice-producing, would be most pernicious in its effects on the world. Arguments from some incidental benefits, such as result from almost every evil or calamity, must not blind us to the real character of a system essentially baleful in tendency.

The rapidity of the Moslem conquests finds no parallel in history. The swiftness of the serried Macedonian phalanx and the resistless sweep of the mighty Roman legion, are eclipsed by the wild-rushing tornado of the Saracen horde. Within a hundred years from the death of the prophet, who bequeathed his sword to Abu Bakr, the vast tide of conquest rolled from the Oxus to the Pillars of Hercules. "*Alla akbar!*" (God is great,) was the battle cry. Damascus, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, Cordova, how rapidly these fell before the storm! "Paradise and the houris are before your faces, hell and the devils are behind your backs!" cried

* A remarkable exaggeration. Moslems are less than one ninth of the world's population.

Khalid, in the great battle of Aijnadin, and the legions of the Emperor Heracleus were crushed with terrible slaughter. We cannot dwell on the subtle, powerful motive that impelled, and the circumstances that favored, the conquests of this desolating host. Fate, fanaticism, lust and spoil, welded into a mighty bolt and hurled against faction-weakened peoples, could hardly fail to crush all opposition. Such was Islam. Our purpose now is with the effects of the system on the countries conquered. They have not been morally elevated. How could they be by such a system, propagated by such men? In the death of Mohammed's successors we have a significant glimpse of the spirit that prevailed. Omar was assassinated by a slave; Othman was murdered by his mutinous soldiers; Ali died from the wounds of Moslems received in a mosque; Hassan was poisoned by his wife; Hussein was shamefully mangled by Moslem soldiers; and thus runs the list. So died the conquerors, and proof cannot be produced that any country overrun by Islam has been morally elevated. What is Arabia today, its original seat; and Mecca, whither all the tribes go up? Speaking of the Wahabees, the Puritans of Islam, Palgrave, who has thoroughly studied them in their home, says:—

> The base-work and ground-color of their character is envy and hatred. Rapacity and licentiousness, though seldom wholly wanting, are accessory embellishments. . . . Of morality, justice, and judgment, mercy and truth, purity of heart and tongue, and all that makes man better, I never heard one syllable." *

This is legitimate to the system, which is in itself a moral blight of a deadly type. Sir William Muir, cautious almost to a fault in coming to conclusions, which he drew from original sources, writes:—

> Setting aside considerations of minor importance, three radical evils flow from the faith. . . . First, polygamy, divorce, and slavery are maintained—striking, as they do, at the root of public morals, poisoning public life, and disorganizing society. Second, freedom of judgment in religion is crushed and annihilated. Toleration is unknown. Third, a barrier has been interposed against the reception of Christianity.†

Hughes testifies:—

> Notwithstanding its fair show of outward observance, and its severe legal enactments, there is something in Islam that strikes at

* "Central Arabia." † "Life of Mahommed."

the very root of morals, poisons domestic life, and in its truest sense disorganizes society. . . . A barrier has been raised not merely against the advance of Christianity, but against the progress of civilization itself. *

Low as was the moral life of Syria, Egypt, and North Africa, where rival Christian sects had almost lost the light and power of the Gospel, Islam left a deposit of depraving ideas that soon sunk those countries much lower. In its wide sway from India to Spain it has done nothing to correct the falsehood, lust, and blood-thirstiness of men, but it has been a pestilential atmosphere developing these into rank and rapid growth. Unscrupulous and persistent in its efforts to make converts, it has made them twofold more the children of hell. The essential spirit of the system is a bloody fanaticism. Major Osborn writes:—

Beheading was most common, but khalifs and governors exhibited a truly devilish ingenuity in devising torments for their enemies. Oriental history abounds with stories of almost incredible cruelty, and these impress the reader with the more horror, because they are told without any expression of wonder and reproach. They were too common to provoke such feeling. †

Twelve centuries have not changed the moral life of Islam except as slightly modified by the system it seeks to override and sweep away. Recall the atrocities perpetrated on the Nestorians—the inhabitants of Crete—the terrible days of the Indian mutiny. Witness the 15,000 butchered Bulgarians, with their hundreds of ravished women and thousands of plundered homes, all put beyond dispute by Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet. Sir George Campbell, writing from the very scene of this fiendish work—and mark, in the most enlightened Moslem rule in the world—says, "There is no sort of doubt of the horror of the atrocities. These things are in no degree exaggerated. I have seen a good deal in my day, but never any thing to compare for one moment with this; and I am satisfied there has been nothing like it in modern times." Now if Islam in the regions described by Professor Blyden is the humane, gentle, loving, reforming thing he seems to find it to be, then we have a phenomenon in the history of the system. It has departed from its traditional animus, and there must be an explanation somewhere. Rev. J. T. Gracey, who recently visited the West

* "Notes on Mohammedanism." † "Islam under the Arabs."

African coast, writes that Bishop Crowther (colored) refers the mild character of Moslems in part to ignorance of the Koran. Mr. Gracey, familiar with Islam for years, gives it as his opinion that the chief reason for this seeming liberality lies in the fact that they are after all only "semi-Mohammedan."* It may be that these disconnected tribes, of low intellectual life, became an easy prey to Islam, and its essential blood-thirstiness is not developed. And yet it is noteworthy that Mr. Gracey mentions a bitter controversy at Lagos, where only the interference of the governor prevented bloodshed.

Doubtless there is some appearance of improvement in the tribes; but reliable morality and well-organized domestic life can never come from Islam. "Never higher than the fountain" is true here also. Moreover, there is a subtle fallacy in the reasoning that seeks to prove Islam a blessing, even for benighted Africa. Doubtless Mormonism might, in many respects, improve the condition, intellectual and material, of the Indians about Salt Lake; but does it occur to any one that Mormonism would be a good evangelizer of the Indians? Should any one look with complacency upon that system of lust and rapine, spreading among the savages? Such a spread of Mormonism would be an incentive to all right-minded Christians to strive all the more mightily to spread the truth. Let no one be deceived into thinking that Islam will smooth the way for the Gospel in Africa. If Islam spreads over that continent, as some of its admirers seem to think it will, it will put off, perhaps for centuries, the conquest of the cross. It may be lamb-like now, because unopposed; but in the end it will be a more stubborn foe to evangelism than the darkness of fetichism and the blight of Africa's deadly malaria. Its spread should be the signal, not for complacency, but for active effort to spread the Gospel. Shame on the messengers of Jesus if they permit the propagandists of Islam to wrest Africa from them! We know not what Islam may be doing on the west coast, but its work on the east coast has been truly diabolical. The history of the slave-trade of the Zanguebar coast is a shadow dark enough to eclipse all the apparent good of the West. We may not speak of the horrors of the slave dhows, of the tens of thousands of girls herded into the shameless slave markets, and of help-

* Christian Advocate, April 5, 1877.

less boys treated with an indignity that may not be mentioned here; and yet Professor Blyden holds up the slavery of Christian nations—always bad enough—in unfavorable contrast with Moslem treatment of the Negro. Dr. Livingstone's entire testimony is against the idea of Africa having received any good from Islam.

But has the Koran, with its system, been the intellectual enlightener and civilizer that some persons claim? We have seen the moral bearing of this book. It is worse than worthless as to scientific value. Its not teaching science would be no argument against it if it had let science and the facts of nature and history alone, and not stated absurdities. According to the Koran the sun sets in a sea of black mud; shooting stars are fiery darts hurled at devils, who are trying to pry into the secrets of heaven; the earth is motionless, held steady by the mountains as vast weights; Alexander built a wall of brass mountain high to keep away Gog and Magog, and it is to remain till the judgment-day; and other puerilities that cannot be mentioned here. Draper says of the Koran, "In science it is absolutely worthless—its astronomy, cosmogony, physiology, invite our mirth." "An impartial reader of the Koran may, doubtless, be surprised that so feeble a production should serve its purpose so well." Its laws as to polygamy, slavery, commerce, calculation of time, etc., utterly unfit this inflexible system, which is founded upon it, for being adapted to a high form of civilization. And yet Syed Ameer Ali has the effrontery to challenge Christian Europe with the assertion that it owes its enlightenment to the Moslems, "whose achievements in the field of intellect owe their origin to the teachings of Mohammed!"

This learned Moslem, who, like all his coreligionists of modern times, owes his enlightenment to Christian Europe, but echoes what he has learned from European apologists of Islam. We may frankly acknowledge the service Moslem conquerors did in the earlier centuries in taking the torch of knowledge, *kindled to their hand by Jewish and Christian teachers*, and bearing it westward to Spain, whence some erudition shined into Western Europe; but this is no more a reason for patronizing Islam than for encouraging idolatry and polytheism because Greece, our master in philosophy and logic, in sculpture

and architecture, worshiped the gods many of the Pantheon. The Koran is opposed to freedom of thought. "To doubt or inquire is to be an infidel," say the teachers of Islam. The slavery of its absolute injunctions and hard literalism is fatal to the development of civilization. Progress, if at all, must be in spite of the spirit of Islam. It is almost a century since White wrote: "Through every country where Mohammedanism is professed the same deep pause is made in philosophy, and the same wide chasm is seen between the opportunities of men to improve and their actual improvement."* Palgrave, so much relied on for correct representations, writes of Arabia: "Islam is in its essence stationary, and was framed thus. Sterile like its God, lifeless like its first principle and supreme original, in all that constitutes true life . . . it justly repudiates all change, all advance and development."† There has been no development among the Turks, although constantly stimulated by the most enlightened nations of Europe. During the past fourteen years the writer of this article has been working in India, which contains a Moslem population nearly double that of the entire Turkish empire. Here Syed Ahmed Khan has been putting forth tremendous efforts to awaken intellectual life in those forty million Moslems. He has planned, and exhorted, and taunted—enduring all the while abuse from the fanatics, who hate enlightenment because it seems to be something Christian. It is true, as Professor Blyden writes, that in the ranks of Islam some "scholars are arising imbued with western knowledge," but they are not the representatives of real Islam. They are opposed to the orthodox traditions of the elders, and are seeking to explain away the manifest import of the Koran. Mr. Gracey, in his recent visit to the west coast of Africa, does not find the enlightenment and blessed effects of Islam mentioned by Bosworth Smith. He writes that Islam, "after more than a thousand years of effort to subjugate those pagan tribes, the Bornaus, Fulahs, Mandingoes, and Jaloofs, have only abandoned some of the rights of paganism, while their belief in some superstitions has been greatly intensified. . . . The center of all this heathenism, its very heart, is just what Mohammedanism has never touched." He refers to the testimony of a missionary, Mr. Picot, who thinks

* "Bampton Lectures." † "Central Arabia."

it would be a grand thing if the Moslem teachers could be made to leave the country.*

The question how far Islam was connected with the revival and spread of learning in Europe is an interesting one. It is a fact we may cheerfully acknowledge, that in the earlier centuries the attention of the Moslems was arrested and drawn toward Greek learning, and their rulers encouraged the translation of works on science and philosophy into Arabic. Greek learning, thus taken up by this new power, followed the Moslem conquerors into Spain, and thence spread into Western Europe. But more credit has frequently been given than is merited here. Two books throw a flood of light on this subject: *Documenta Philosophiæ Arabum*, by A. Smoelders: Bonnœ, 1836; and *Recherches sur anciennes traditiones d'Aristote*, by A. Jourdain. Paris. 1843. From these books many interesting facts may be learned. In the eighth century the rising Moslem power came in contact with the Nestorian schools of Mesopotamia and Persia. The Greek language was known in those countries from the time of Alexander's conquests. The Nestorian schools were famous for the subtleties of metaphysics and for scientific discussions. The Nestorians translated the principal Greek works on philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, and medicine into Arabic; or, perhaps, first into Syriac, then into Arabic. Under their Christian tutors, the Moslems—in spite of the opposition of their own orthodox doctors—made the acquaintance of Greek learning, which they carried with them to Spain. But it is a mistake to suppose that the *renaissance* in Europe is due to this movement of Islam. Some effect it most certainly had, but it must not be overrated. None of the Greek poets, orators, or historians, which have exerted so powerful an influence on Europe, were translated. Their names, even, do not seem to have been known.

The opinion that the works of Aristotle were unknown to Western Europe till made known by the Arabs, cannot be sustained. Jourdain proves by citations from Boëthius of the fifth century, that the works of Aristotle were known in Western Europe long before the Moslems came. Undoubtedly some useful discoveries were made by them; but this point

* Christian Advocate for April 12, 1877.

also has been overrated. Credit is due them for some discoveries in chemistry and the healing art. Their astronomy was that of Ptolemy. But little progress was ever made by them in mathematics. It is not likely—although generally supposed—that we are indebted to them for the system of arithmetical notation in use. These figures were known to Boëthius, and most probably were introduced from India through Egypt, and were adopted by the Arabs when they conquered Spain. Their discoveries in Algebra have been overrated. Dr. Hutton shows that their problems were anticipated by Diophantus. They had but little idea of the utility of the science. In the main the Arabs were but rude copyists, who rendered only small service in carrying science forward, and the debt of the world to Islam is not at all overwhelming. The aid given has been only incidental and temporary. Christians gave to the Moslems their first impulse toward civilization, an impulse which, after expanding for a time, subsided, and left them incapable and unprogressive from defects inherent in their system, and they soon fell into a state of intellectual decrepitude. It is the glory of Christian nations that they can claim Bacon, whose inductive laws have reconstructed the scientific world, and put investigation and progress on a true basis for all time.

A glance at the material condition of Moslem countries indicates much as to the effects of Islam on the world. Moslem countries have fallen centuries behind the progress of the age. A reign of superficial brilliancy, when conquest led the Moslem conquerors into prosperity, was soon followed by exhaustion and ruin. They wasted the countries conquered. Palestine, once a garden, is now almost a desert. Egypt has never prospered under Islam. With all her grand capacities in times of peace, her debt has accumulated at the rate of $30,000,000 for ten years past. "Turkey comprises within its limits the ancient Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor, Thrace, and Macedonia, once teeming with population, threaded with solidly-built roads, dotted thickly with cities and harbors, and supporting with ease the wars of Alexander, of his successors, and of the Lower Empire of the Khalifs of Baghdad. Now barely £4,000,000 a year is squeezed out of it; not a decent road exists in the country save what has been made by

the hated Franks on borrowed capital." * Sir H. Rawlinson says, "In the hands of the Turk the country never will improve, for the faith of Islam is incompatible with civilization." Palgrave, always appreciative of any thing good in Islam, says, "Transient vigor, followed by long and irremediable decay, is the general history of Mohammedan Governments and races." Again, "When the Koran and Mecca shall have disappeared from Arabia, then, and then only, can we seriously expect to see the Arab assume a place in the ranks of civilization, from which Mohammed and his book have, more than any other individual cause, long held him back." †

In India, where Islam has had a development grander than its most magnificent era in Spain, we meet with only decadence and material collapse. A vast and relentless parasite, Islam in time consumed to ruin the resources of a country almost boundless in capacity. Under Moslem rule there was but little incentive to accumulate property, for it was liable to be seized or exorbitantly taxed by Government. People lived in a state of fear and uncertainty. Females dared not to put on jewelry through fear of attracting the avarice of an incapable Government or of high-handed robbers. The English Government could well anticipate an increase of thirty-two per cent. of revenue in a very few years, in a state of security under their rule, when they took the country. Lands that sold for a few hundred rupees under Moslem rule, now sell for more thousands twice told. The Province of Oude, which under Hindu rule teemed with a thrifty population, under Moslem rule lost many inhabitants. Often the oppressed cultivator would escape across the Ganges to British territory under a shower of bullets. In the few years since the English have annexed Oude population has increased, and the price of land has more than doubled. All these facts bear testimony against the system we are passing under review.

Islam, like Judaism, is an anachronism; but, unlike Judaism, we cannot admit for it the divine sanction. It is a rude plagiarism from that system, preserving but little of its virtues, incorporating much that is fatal to morality and progress. It is essentially barbarism, incapable of keeping pace with true

* Calcutta Review for January, 1874. † "Central Arabia."

progress, and from its nature incapable of reform. Its founder was a deceiver—possessing, no doubt, some virtues, but whose character and career must for all time expose him to the grave charge of *imposture*, and call upon him the reprehension of mankind; while the system that he promulgated, and with which he has enslaved and degraded and demoralized millions of the race, must, in spite of some good claimed for it, continue to merit the disapprobation of those who represent the far nobler light which Islam seeks to put out in darkness. Only the Omniscient knows just what the fate of this system is to be. But with the Russian pressing it on the north, and England circumscribing and encroaching on it on the east, and Europe on the west, tearing from it country after country, no wonder that it instinctively and cunningly seeks an outlet and new lease of life southward in the vast continent of Africa. If the Christian missionaries are true to their colors a conflict must come there also. Patience and forbearance and charity we must have, but there can be no compromise with the false prophet. Civilization, too, must encounter here this barbarism of the Arabian desert. Thus begirt and pressed by the advancing Christian powers—inflexible—bigoted—defiant, its end is a problem unsolved. The stirring events around Constantinople, its political head, indicate a crisis. God rules among the nations.

## Art. II.—CITY METHODISM.*

The *status* of Methodism in large cities, about which there has been so much discussion lately, is not a new question either to American or English Methodists. The careful reader of our denominational press in late years might have supposed that the prevailing sentiment of the Church was that city Methodism had fallen seriously behind country Methodism in vigor and relative growth. As much as this was admitted against Methodism in London, in 1870, by The Methodist Recorder. This paper stated that while the Wesleyans were more numerous in the

* For convenience' sake the word "Methodism" is applied throughout this article to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that only.

whole of England than either the Congregationalists or the Baptists, they had in London only half as many ministers and chapels as the former, and were outnumbered considerably by the latter. When such an admission was made for the great English metropolis, where the first Methodist chapel in the world was opened, and when our own denominational press was asking what should be done to give us "commanding influence in the cities," * and to fill up the appealing (?) array of empty pews which many of our city Churches present," † it would have been natural to infer that the *status* of Methodism in cities was by no means considered a satisfactory one.

When, however, The Independent, in February last, set out to show by certain statistical comparisons what is the exact *status* of Methodism in our large cities, the Methodist press began a vigorous defense against the statements and conclusions advanced. This may have been done to bring out all the facts bearing upon the subject of controversy; if so, the opponents may be expected in good time to accept all that has been conclusively demonstrated. Nothing more than this is asked; nothing more expected. It has been hinted that The Independent has been governed by a selfish motive in what it has done, desiring to strengthen the Congregational denomination by the disintegration of the Methodist Episcopal Church through the abolition of the itinerancy. It may be that to this belief is due the sharpness of some of the criticisms which have been made upon its work. However this may be, the imputation is unjust. The articles were inspired by no other motive than the desire to do a service to the Methodist Episcopal Church. If the truth has been set forth in good spirit no unworthy motives can justly be attributed to that paper. The truth should always be welcome to us. As a Methodist layman, whose religious opinions and sympathies are heartily Methodistic, I do not consider it at all disgraceful or damaging to the Church to admit all that is charged against city Methodism. No one Church can rightly claim to combine with the peculiar excellences of its own those of all other ecclesiastical systems.

If we have had an unequaled success in rural districts, where the Protestant Episcopal Church has undoubtedly made a com-

* The Methodist, 1870. † Zion's Herald, 1876.

parative failure, it is more to the credit and glory of Methodism than if it had specially sought out the rich and cultured classes, and neglected those less favored. In this, our Church has been following in the footsteps of the Master, who chose his followers not from among the wealthy and learned, but from the ranks of the poor and uncultured; and his work was chiefly among this class. Though American Methodism began its existence in a city, it soon took root in the country, where it found congenial and fruitful soil, and thousands upon thousands of souls were gathered into its societies who but for its agency might never have known the second birth. Here again did it follow the example of Christ, who did not confine his labors to Jerusalem. Its polity, and its plain, practical, pentecostal preaching, were admirably suited to the times and people, and it won success because it deserved it. If Methodism, absorbed with its God-given mission to the country populations, failed to cultivate the city field with as much success relatively as it obtained outside of it, it need not now be ashamed of its record. But it is surely time to inquire what the real facts are, and what must be done to strengthen, if necessary, our position and influence in the cities. What, if any thing, prevents us from increasing our strength and influence in them? Is our polity adapted to the highest success in urban fields?

These are questions which it can do the Church no harm to consider. I do not understand that it is claimed that our polity and methods are absolutely perfect; I *do* understand that it is claimed that our ecclesiastical system has been developed providentially and gradually; and I am not among those who believe that Providence has nothing more to suggest in the direction of improvement. There ought not to be, it seems to me, two opinions among Methodists on the question of ascertaining all the facts respecting the success or want of success of Methodism in cities, and the efficiency of the probationary system. To throw light upon the former subject was the object of the discussion started last year. What was said about probationers, until the appearance of Mr. Atkinson's article in the July number of this REVIEW, was merely incidental.

As the evident purpose of Mr. Atkinson's article is to answer and overthrow The Independent's statements and conclusions, it will be first in order to ascertain what that journal set out to

do. It is not improbable that the sense in which the phrase, "comparative failure," was used has not been rightly understood. The word "failure," even when qualified by the adjective "comparative," conveys a strong meaning, and may have led some to suppose that it was intended to humiliate Methodism, by denying that it had done any thing in cities worthy of mention. I do not know, however, of any phrase which would have better fitted the facts. The meaning which it was intended the phrase should convey was carefully guarded. The phrase, as stated at the beginning, was not used to mean that Methodism "has no strength or standing" in the cities. The idea intended to be conveyed was, that it was "not an absolute, but a comparative failure." What other words could be used to describe so accurately the facts set forth—those facts being that relatively to the population, Methodism is but little more than half as strong in the leading cities as in the country? The proposition was that "Methodism is a comparative failure in cities," and it was sought to establish it—

First, by a comparison of Methodism in the great cities with Methodism in the country; and, second, by showing that city Methodism, as compared with country Methodism, was far less successful than either city Presbyterianism, as compared with country Presbyterianism, or city Episcopalianism, as compared with country Episcopalianism.

It will be seen that this offer of proof does not include the simple comparison of Methodism with Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism. Not a word was said at any time about the simple numerical ascendency, although the table given in the first article, as a starting point, showed that the Methodists were outnumbered by the other two denominations; but the correction of an error, in the next article, placed our Church at the head of the list. Such a comparison would have proved nothing in this case, except that Methodism was not an absolute failure in cities—a charge which was disclaimed at the outset. The degree of numerical success achieved by Methodism in cities could not have been ascertained in this way. The proposition would have been established, however, by proving that city Methodism has seriously fallen behind country Methodism. But if the comparison had been carried no farther it might have been argued that the other denominations, confronted by

the same obstacle—the large and "inaccessible" foreign-born element—were doing no better, relatively. Therefore, Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism were brought into the comparison—the former as an example of a Church achieving nearly the same degrees of success in both city and country, and the latter as an instance of the attainment of a high degree, relatively, of success in cities.

Seven of the largest cities were taken for the statistical exhibit, and when it was objected that the basis was not broad enough, eighteen more were added, the twenty-five embracing all having a population of fifty thousand and upwards. With the seven cities, it was shown that while twenty-nine thousand of the country population produce one thousand Methodist members, it requires forty-six thousand of city population to produce the same number. On the basis of the twenty-five cities a similar result was obtained. Going further, in order to meet objections against the large foreign element in the population of the cities, it was also proved that, excluding it from both the country and the twenty-five cities, twenty-four thousand of the American-born population in the country produce one thousand Methodists, while thirty-two thousand of the same class of city population are required to produce the same number.

If it was Mr. Atkinson's design to overthrow these statements, he should, it seems to me, have met them carefully, and shown where the errors (if any) lay, and why (if such were the fact) the proofs were insufficient. But he has made no allegations against the correctness and sufficiency of either the matter or manner of proof. There is only an implied impeachment of these in his statistical work. He has taken a different basis for his calculations—that of the cities (fourteen in number) having 100,000 population and upwards, but he has assigned no reason for it. What I now purpose is an examination of the statistics which he offers to warrant his conclusion that Methodism is as successful in cities as in the country.

His proposition is to "demonstrate by unimpeachable proof" that Methodism has "shown equal adaptation to both" city and country. The first proof he offers is the numerical ascendency of Methodism in the cities over Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, etc. This is a fact which has never been denied, but its force as a

proof of the proposition is not apparent to me. His second mode of proof is a comparison of city with country Methodism; but he does not make relative comparisons with Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism. His total of Methodist communicants for the fourteen cities is 102,351. This includes 13,650 probationers; but as this comparison is confined to Methodism itself, the result is the same whether they are included or not. The objection to them as not being members may, therefore, be waived here. He says that "the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the fourteen cities are $2\frac{47}{100}$ per cent. of the population, or about one in forty," and that outside of them the ratio is one communicant to about twenty-two inhabitants. There is in these statements an unmistakable admission that The Independent's proposition is true. There is no ground in them for any other conclusion. The admission is, substantially, that applying to the cities the ratio of Methodist communicants to country population, city Methodism falls short nearly one half. All that is said about the large "inaccessible" foreign population of the cities can in no wise affect the judgment which must be rendered upon the question, Has Methodism succeeded as well in the cities as it has in the country? The "inaccessible" argument is only admissible as a plea in mitigation. The cities must be taken as they are, foreign population and all. If Methodism cannot reach this foreign element it is not adapted to cities, because this element forms a very large proportion of their population. I believe, on the contrary, that Methodism can and does reach this class. We are constantly winning converts of all nationalities, and from Roman Catholic, Jewish, and other religions. There are many such converts in our ministry. Our work among the foreign populations of the United States has attained to large proportions. Of the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church one in every nineteen speaks a foreign language; and who can tell the number of those of foreign birth or parentage, and using the English tongue, who are returned as Methodist members? Nor should it be forgotten that the Church has been greatly strengthened by immigrants from Great Britain and Europe. We have many useful and some prominent men in our pulpits who are of foreign birth. I certainly believe that Methodism is adapted to all peoples. The Presbyterian Church (without considering

the foreign element) does fully as well among the city as it does among the country people, and why should not the Methodist? The Protestant Episcopal Church is almost thrice as successful in the city as it is in the country, while Methodism is not much more than half as strong relatively in the former as it is in the latter. If we take Mr. Atkinson's statistics for the fourteen cities as a basis, we shall find that the relative standing of the three denominations in city and country is as follows:—

| Church. | Ratio in Country. | Ratio in City. |
|---|---|---|
| Protestant Episcopal | 1 in 164 | 1 in 58 |
| Presbyterian | 1 in 57 | 1 in 53 |
| Methodist Episcopal | 1 in 22 | 1 in 40 |

These figures I believe to represent fairly the relative position of each Church. The Methodist statistics here include probationers. If the probationers were left out the Methodist ratio would be 46 in the cities, and correspondingly smaller in the country.

Now, the result arrived at by The Independent on the basis, first, of seven cities, and, second, on that of twenty-five, was—in cities 1 Methodist *member* to every 46 of the population, in the country 1 to every 29. Taking Mr. Atkinson's figures—88,701 *members* in the fourteen cities, and dividing the number into the population of those cities—4,130,000—a result is obtained of 46. The same ratio holds good, therefore, whether seven, fourteen, or twenty-five cities be taken as a basis.

Passing now to Mr. Atkinson's statistical comparison of city with country Methodism, I beg, in order to do him no injustice, to quote that part of his article in full:—

After subtracting the foreign-born population of the fourteen cities from the total foreign-born population of the United States, we have remaining 4,094,482. The foreign-born population of the fourteen cities, as we have seen, is over 35 per cent. of the entire population of those cities; while the foreign-born population outside of these cities is to the total population of the United States exclusive of them—which is 34,426,094—in the ratio of $11\frac{89}{100}$ per cent., or considerably less than one eighth. The communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the fourteen cities are $2\frac{47}{100}$ per cent. of the population, or, about 1 in 40. But more than half of the population, as we have shown, is inaccessible to Methodism, consequently the real proportion is about *one communicant to twenty of the population.* Exclusive of the four-

teen cities the ratio to the population is $4\frac{41}{100}$ per cent., or, about *one Methodist Episcopal communicant to twenty-two inhabitants.*

It is to be regretted that Mr. Atkinson did not give his mathematical operations at this point more in detail. That he has made a mistake is evident, but whether the error lies in failing to deduct the total population of the cities, or the foreign element outside the cities, from that of the whole country, cannot be certainly determined. There is no doubt that such an error has been committed. This will make it plain:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Population of the United States | 38,558,371 |
| Population of the fourteen cities | 4,130,000 |
| Foreign-born outside cities | 4,094,482—8,224,482 |
| Total | 30,333,889 |

Now 30,333,889÷1,548,600 (the number of communicants outside the cities)=19—a very different result from that which Mr. Atkinson obtained. By adding either the population of the cities, or the number of foreign-born inhabitants outside the cities to the dividend—30,333,889—the quotient will be increased to 22. By an oversight, therefore, Mr. Atkinson made a more favorable exhibit for city Methodism than the facts warrant. My supposition is, that notwithstanding the words "exclusive of the fourteen cities," etc., he deducted the foreign-born population, and not that of the cities, because he actually makes that subtraction in a preceding sentence. But not only did he err in this, but also as to the children of the foreign-born population outside the cities. In addition to the 1,472,000 of foreign-born people in the fourteen cities, he deducts 15 per cent. for their children, "who," he says, "like their parents, are generally hostile to evangelical Protestantism." The number of these children is, therefore, 593,000, which is one child to every 2·46 of the foreign-born parents. Now, if such allowance is to be made for the children of foreign-born parents in the cities, where they are as generally employed in Protestant families as the same class can be in the country, it ought also to be made for the children of foreign parentage outside the cities. The argument applies with as much force to the country as to the cities. There is, then, 1,651,000 more to be deducted for children of foreign parents in the country, which reduces the dividend to 28,682,889, and, consequently, the

quotient to 18. Now, if the Methodist Episcopal Church does as well among the American-born population of the fourteen cities as it does among the same population outside them, it will have 114,722 communicants in them. It has, in fact, 102,351, which includes several thousand foreign-born communicants. If these be taken out the deficiency will, of course, be much larger. This is the most favorable exhibit that can be made for city Methodism. Having taken out half the population of the fourteen largest cities in the United States, it is found that in them our Church falls behind itself in the country 10 per cent. Taking the country and cities as they stand, (without deductions,) the Church falls behind in the latter 45 per cent. The facts in regard to the foreign-born population of the fourteen cities are, that, comparing the census of 1870 with that of 1860, it will be found that of the total increase of these cities in that period, about 283,000 belongs to the foreign-born population, and about 873,000 to the American-born. The proportion to the whole population of the foreign-born inhabitants in these cities is considerably smaller than it was in 1860. Then the foreign element comprised 40 per cent. of the total population; now it comprises 36.

Much has been said, as an offset to the criticisms made on city Methodism, about the peculiar difficulties the Church has had to contend with. Other Churches were here before the Methodist and preoccupied the ground. That is true, yet American Methodism is more than one hundred and ten years old, and it does not require a century in a free country like this, with no entanglement of Church and State, to put all Churches on a level of opportunity. Furthermore, one hundred years ago our cities were small and comparatively insignificant. Their strength and influence have been acquired in the present century, and Methodism has had its opportunity to grow with them.* It is not as though Methodism began its race in the cities as they now exist, and under such conditions as would be imposed in this day, although a new denomination might even now find a large enough field for work in them. But if the "preoccupation" argument may be used in favor of city Methodism, it ought to have the same force when applied to country

* Of the fourteen cities, eight were incorporated in this century, four in the first quarter and four in the second.

Methodism. If it can be shown, therefore, that the latter, in any instance, has advanced against the same obstacle—preoccupation—more rapidly than the former has, the argument will be robbed of its force as an excuse for city Methodism. For this purpose let us take Massachusetts. I do not know of a stronger case. Every one, I am sure, will concede that the towns and villages of that State were as largely "preoccupied" by the Congregational and other denominations as were any of the cities; furthermore, Methodism in New York and Baltimore has had the advantage of a quarter of a century in age over itself in Massachusetts. Yet it has found opportunity to establish itself in that State. Leaving out Boston, I find that one in every thirty-one of the population of the State is a Methodist communicant. Comparing Methodism in Massachusetts with Methodism in New York city we have this result: In Massachusetts there is 1 communicant to every 31 of the population; in New York 1 to 76. Here is a difference against city Methodism of 59 per cent. We see, therefore, that the "preoccupation" argument will not explain the weakness of Methodism in New York city. The same argument could be pleaded as effectually for country Methodism in nearly all the seaboard States as it can for Massachusetts. As another illustration of the weakness of the arguments advanced in behalf of city Methodism Baltimore may be used. This has always been regarded as a Methodist city, in which Methodist strength and influence are far in advance of those of any other Protestant denomination. It has there had a fair chance, "preoccupying" the ground itself, and having a comparatively small foreign element to narrow its field. Now let us see how Methodism in this Methodist city compares with country Methodism as found in the State to which Baltimore belongs. The latter has a population of 267,354, and, according to Mr. Atkinson, 17,007 communicants. The population of the State, leaving out Baltimore, is 513,540, and the number of communicants outside Baltimore, as nearly as I can ascertain, 50,450. The ratio, therefore, is, in Baltimore 1 communicant to every 16 of the population; and outside Baltimore, 1 to every 10. As the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has only 1,432 members in Baltimore, while it must have a larger number relatively outside the city, it does no injustice to Baltimore Meth-

odism not to include the statistics of that Church. Taking out the foreign-born element in both city and country, and likewise from the communicants, I find that the result is: in Baltimore, 1 communicant in every 13 of the American-born population; and outside Baltimore 1 in every 9—a difference of 30 per cent. against the city.

I have yet another case to bring forward. It will not be denied, I presume, that our Church has had an equal opportunity with other Protestant denominations to go up and possess Chicago. Methodism was over 650,000 strong when Chicago was incorporated, in 1837, with 4,170 inhabitants. If the methods and polity of Methodism are adapted to cities, as they unquestionably are to the country, we shall be justified in looking for a high degree of success in Chicago. But it will appear that, whatever may be the cause, our Church is weak in the city, as compared with its great strength in the State. We have in Illinois, if I have made no mistake, (I have gathered the figures from nine conferences,) about 124,000 communicants. Outside of Chicago the total is 117,707, which is in the proportion of 1 communicant to every 19 of the population. In Chicago the proportion is 1 to every 47. Chicago Methodism, therefore, falls behind Illinois Methodism about 59 per cent. Subtracting the foreign-born population from both city and State, and also leaving out the foreign communicants, the result is: in Chicago 1 communicant to every 33 of the American born population, and outside Chicago 1 in every 17, showing that Methodism in Chicago is about 48 per cent. behind itself in the State even on this basis. Further than this, I do not believe that Chicago Methodism is very vigorous or enterprising. It is certainly not growing with the city; for, while the latter has multiplied its population (from 1840 to 1870) by about 60, Methodism has multiplied itself in the same period by only 26. In 1840 1 in every 32 was a Methodist; in 1870 the proportion was 1 in every 74. The difference between this last result, 74, and the former, 47, is owing to the fact that in the first instance Methodist statistics for 1876 are given, but the city population is that of the census of 1870. This fact affects Methodism favorably in all the other cities, the Methodist statistics of 1876 being compared with the population of 1870.

Now what are the facts concerning the "preoccupation" of

New York city, which had a population of about 16,000 when Methodism first entered it? In 1785 it had in all nine Churches, the strongest of which were probably the Reformed Dutch, which cared principally for the Dutch. How many Presbyterians there were I have not been able to ascertain, but the Protestant Episcopal Church could not have been very strong, for it had only five clergymen in the whole State. In New York, as elsewhere, that Church suffered terribly during the Revolutionary War. Trinity Church, in New York city, was burned, and outside Philadelphia Episcopal worship could scarcely be maintained, such was the feeling against the English Church. Peace found its Churches disorganized and going to pieces, and it was not until after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the Protestant Episcopal Church began its career as an organized denomination. It had, however, a social prestige which Methodism could not boast of for at least half a century after the rise of the latter in America. Another explanation of the slow rate of increase of city Methodism is that the cities—New York especially—are passing into the possession of foreign-born people, and that, in consequence, native Americans are moving out of them into the country. In this way, as some think, New York city Methodism has suffered considerable losses. There are some facts, however, which operate against this supposition. New York city added to its population between 1860 and 1870 only 35,377 foreign-born persons out of a total increase of 128,623. In 1860 there was one person of foreign birth to every 2.12 of the population; in 1870 the proportion was one to every 2.24. Even New York is not, therefore, increasing relatively that element of its population which is regarded as "inaccessible to Protestantism."

There is a large influx into New York, and most of the other cities, of persons from all parts of the country, most of whom, at least for a while, make their homes in the city. Those who go to Brooklyn to reside are, of course, not lost to city Methodism if they be Methodists. Each of the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, has suburbs which include quite a large territory of country where those disliking residence in the heart of the city may find pleasant homes. The cities must receive large additions every year from the best of the country population, and Methodism is to be presumed to have its share

of this immigration from the rural districts. If, therefore, Methodism is constantly losing in New York and other cities by the removal of members to the rural districts, it is also constantly gaining by the stream of immigration flowing into the city from the country.

In surveying the whole ground, and giving all the weight to the defenses of city Methodism which seems to me to be due to them, I find nothing that will serve as a sufficient excuse for being satisfied with the present *status* of city Methodism. Whether we look at it from a statistical point of view, or compare its power and influence over the community with those of the leading Protestant denominations, we cannot escape the conclusion that it is much weaker than it ought to be. I do not mean to ignore what it has accomplished already; the fact that we can point to large and important results achieved in the past should give us courage to put forth larger and more intelligent efforts in the future. We can do vastly better than we have done when we shall have come to a better understanding of the nature of our difficulties.

Our present duty, it seems to me, is (1) to satisfy ourselves of the facts regarding the *status* of the Church in the cities; (2) to ascertain what are the difficulties which prevent a complete success; and, (3) to remove them. It is not my purpose now to go on to indicate what, in my opinion, these difficulties are. They can be found and better explained by older and wiser men than myself. I will content myself, in leaving this subject, with this single observation: city Churches need *pastors*.

I have already said all that I wish to on the subject named in the title of this article. The probationer question is a distinct and independent one, affecting, so far as I know, city and country Churches alike. However, as Mr. Atkinson has treated it in connection with Methodism in cities, I have no choice but to follow his example.

It ought not to be long a question with us whether the probationary system is working efficiently and beneficially, because it need not be. The statistical part of our "General Minutes" gives but one column to the probationers, and there are no means of ascertaining accurately, and from official figures, the number of probationers who are yearly lost to the Church.

But at any time the General Conference can order additional tables to be prepared, and it would then be made the duty of every pastor to report all the facts necessary to the answer of the question, What becomes of our probationers? The attention of the Church has been called to this subject more than once, and the fear has been expressed that the system causes heavy losses to the Church. There is, it seems to me, in the facts which are accessible to all, good grounds for the fear. For instance, the fact that in 1874 there were 218,432 probationers, and that the net increase of full members in the following year was only 39,063, is one of significance. What became of the other five sixths? Unfortunately, this question cannot be answered conclusively. All that we can do is to make shrewd guesses. We cannot say, with absolute certainty, that the losses occur among probationers; they may occur among members, in which case we should have a much graver evil to face. It seems to me that the inference to be drawn from Mr. Atkinson's statements is, that we hold our probationers, but lose our members. I am unwilling to believe that we lose about 95,000 members a year by "absence, withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters," and by expulsions. I prefer to look for the "losses" (which seem to be conceded) among the raw recruits, rather than among the veterans, but am ready to accept the truth wherever I find it.

Mr. Atkinson takes the number of probationers reported in 1875, (196,407,) and endeavors to show what became of them in 1876. He would have done better, it seems to me, to have taken a broader basis, say ten years; he would then have obtained a fair average, and not have run the risk of falling upon an exceptional case. Now, having taken the number of probationers reported in 1875, Mr. Atkinson had to ascertain, first, what the net increase of members was in 1876; and, second, what losses the total membership sustained by death and otherwise. The net increase he found was about 38,000, and the deaths (of members) numbered 18,830; then he estimated, on the basis of the statistical report of the Congregational denomination for 1876, that 4,500 were expelled, and that 90,000 were lost to the Church "by absence, withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters." Footing these up, he found that he had accounted for 151,330 of the 196,407 probationers, and had

45,077, or 23 per cent., left. Of this number many, in his opinion, would be ultimately received into the Church.

This would be an excellent showing for the probationary system if it were correct, but there are errors in it which rob it of its value. The chief of these is based on a misunderstanding of the Congregational statistics. The number of Congregational members, 45,033, reported absent in 1876, represents not merely the absentees of that year; "most of them are of long standing, that is, from one to ten years' standing."* This is not merely my own supposition; the words quoted are from the compiler of the statistics, and are, therefore, conclusive. He further says that there may have been 5,000 new absentees in 1876, but there are no means of verifying this estimate. It is fair to assume, however, that if ten years produce 45,033 absentees, one year will produce 4,500. If we take 5,000, therefore, as the number of absentees in 1876, we make a liberal allowance. With 5,000 as a basis, we shall reach a result very different from that which Mr. Atkinson obtains. Let us revise his estimates. The item "expelled" may be stricken out altogether, because the number is very small, and must be more than equaled by the accessions from other Churches. Now we have—

| | |
|---|---|
| Increase of full members | 38,000 |
| Deaths | 18,830 |
| Losses occasioned by withdrawals, joining other Churches, and retaining letters, say | 20,000 |
| Deaths of probationers | 2,700 |
| Total of new members in 1876 | 79,530 |
| Number of probationers in 1875 | 196,407 |
| Number of probationers unaccounted for | 116,877 |

It will be observed that I have multiplied the number of Congregational absentees (5,000) by four because our denomination is about four times as large as the Congregational. Mr. Atkinson multiplied the same item by two; I am, therefore, doing no injustice to his side of the case. Furthermore, I have added 2,700 for deaths among the probationers, using to obtain these figures the ratio which the deaths reported in the "Minutes" bear to the number of members.

*From a letter to the writer from the Rev. Dr. C. Cushing, editor of The Congregational Quarterly.

The above table shows that of the 196,407 probationers reported in 1875 only about 80,000, or 40 per cent., became members in 1876. There remain unaccounted for at the end of 1876 over 116,000 probationers, minus the number that were dropped during the year. Mr. Atkinson's estimate left 23 per cent. unaccounted for, but many, he believed, would hold over to 1877. If we say that 20 per cent. of the 196,407 hold over to 1877, we are dealing very liberally with his argument. 20 per cent. of 196,407 is 39,000, and 116,000—39,000 —77,000, which would appear to be the number of probationers who are lost. But there are two other facts to be taken into consideration. Mr. Atkinson, probably, does not hold that the 90,000 which he sets down for absentees, and those retaining letters, are a total and final loss to the Church, because absentees and those retaining letters do return and present themselves or their letters to pastors. There must, therefore, have been absentees, etc., of former years who returned in 1876, and helped to increase the number of members; but he has forgotten to make any use of them in his table. He also neglected to make an estimate of those who became members within the conference year and were never represented in the column of probationers in the Annual "Minutes." How much of the increase of members in 1876 was due to this item it would be hard to determine. We are justified, however, in estimating it to be quite large, because if the probationary system works efficiently the majority will be received into full membership at the close of the regular term of six months. Many of those, therefore, who enter upon the probationary relation within the first six months of the conference year may be received into full membership before the close of the year. As half of the conferences meet in the fall and half in the spring, it will be readily seen how thousands of new members may be received in the conference year without ever being reported as probationers. When this fact is applied to the problem before us it, of course, enlarges the number of probationers, and consequently the disproportion between the probationers and the new members.

Although, as the result of an extended investigation of the whole subject, I am led to the conclusion that it is utterly impossible, without more official data, accurately to answer the

question, "What becomes of our probationers?" I am satisfied that Mr. Atkinson's estimate that 77 per cent. of our probationers are received into full membership is much too high. I do not think that the revised table which I have offered, estimating the losses at about 40 per cent., is unfair to the probationary system, yet I will not put it forward as a solution of the problem. I fear that the actual facts, if they were known, would be less favorable to the system than are my estimates.* My main purpose in writing these pages is to point out the errors Mr. Atkinson has made, and to make it reasonably certain that, whether from the defects of the system or from the lax administration of pastors, or from a combination of both, an alarmingly large proportion of our probationers never become members of the Church. It is a matter which the General Conference should consider at its next session.

## ART. III.—EDUCATION AMONG THE FREEDMEN.

EVERY BODY remembers the *dictum* of the plantation, to the effect that the negro was of so inferior a capacity as not to admit of his education, and that any attempt to train him up in the ways of civilization would always be a failure. It was known that this was an interested opinion, but it gained such large credence among intelligent people that, when the extraordinary case of Benjamin Banneker was brought to the knowledge of Mr. Jefferson, in 1791, he accepted the facts as going a long way to prove the contrary.

Banneker was born of free parents in Maryland, at Ellicott's Mills, not far from Baltimore. After reaching the age of manhood he learned to read, and from that starting-point advanced rapidly in such knowledge as was within the reach of a poor man who bore the brand of an enslaved race. He had great skill in the use of tools, great power of invention, and was a profound and accurate observer. In 1787 George Ellicott,

* Since writing this article I have seen the Newark Conference Minutes for 1876, which state, that of 3,322 probationers on 149 charges in 1875, only 1,372 became members in 1876. A fair calculation shows that 48 per cent. were lost.

noticing his genius, furnished him with a variety of works on astronomy, which he devoured with avidity and put to practical use. He made a clock, and other instruments, to help him in his astronomical researches, and in 1791 brought out an Almanac, which was published annually in Baltimore till his death, in 1804.

Banneker sent the manuscript of his first Almanac to Mr. Jefferson, with a manly letter, to which the Virginia statesman made prompt reply. In it he said:—

> Nobody wishes more than I do to see such proofs as you exhibit that nature has given to our black brethren talents equal to those of the other colors of men, and that the appearance of the want of them is owing only to the degraded condition of their existence, both in Africa and America.

Before closing he says:—

> I have taken the liberty to send your Almanac to Monsieur de Condorset, Secretary of the Academy of Sciences at Paris and Member of the Philanthropic Society, because I consider it a document to which your whole color has a right, for their justification against the doubts which have been entertained of them.

But there were very few, especially in the South, who shared Mr. Jefferson's power of abstracting himself from present interests and prejudices, and recognizing the capabilities of a race in the examples of its highest types. And at a later period, when the discussions in relation to slavery grew intense and fierce, and local prejudices were more and more excited, it became the general doctrine of those who defended the "divine institution" that slavery was the normal condition of the negro, and that he was doomed to it because of his incapacity to be educated and to stand on the same general plane as the Anglo-Saxon. Hence, when the war broke out and the escaped slaves came rushing to our camps in their poverty and helplessness, and their first cry was for a spelling-book and for the aid of some one who could teach them to read it, there was a genuine feeling of amazement, not only throughout the South, but, in a less degree, throughout the North.

We had been accustomed to see immigrants from all the nations of the old world flock to our shores, mostly of the proud white races, but destitute of the elements of learning, and not at all anxious to improve their mental condition. Especially

had we seen great armies of Celts come to us from old, historic Ireland, lying under the shadow of the British crown, but coming with no aspirations after learning, and neither seeking for educational help nor allowing it to be thrust upon them. Of all the ignorant millions that have thus found homes on the shores of America, the adults who have put out their hands for books and have sought instruction in letters could almost be counted on your fingers. The children have been pretty uniformly admitted to our schools, but the adults have seldom had the perseverance necessary to acquaint themselves with the elements of learning.

But as soon as our armies of invasion found a lodgment at Port Royal, and at Hampton, and along the valley of the Mississippi, the slaves that were taken by force, or that came stealthily to our camps to escape from their life-long oppression, manifested the strongest desire to understand that mystery by which the white man was able to talk with his book. General Eaton, now the enterprising head of our Bureau of Education, who was placed in charge of all the "contrabands" in the valley of the Mississippi, amounting before the close of the war to perhaps a hundred thousand, informed the writer that nearly all of them furnished themselves with spelling-books as one of their first acquirements; and at any moment of their leisure they would drop down on a stone or log, and, drawing out the book from its hiding-place, would con over the mysterious combinations which were the key to that greater volume of knowledge which they desired to open.

But there was another element in the process of lifting up this down-trodden race not less remarkable than their own avidity to learn. It is not often that the world has seen one race, with a high civilization, take by the hand another race, of a low civilization, and seek to elevate it to its own level; but that is about what took place after the inauguration of the late war, when the escaped "contrabands" appealed to us for protection and aid. Progress in civilization has generally been through the slow process of experience. Men, profiting by their own failures and successes, have, in the course of slow centuries, grown gradually into better conditions without much extraneous aid; and it is a new thing, due probably to a better conception of Christian character, for a whole people to stretch

out a helping hand to the rescued slave, and to thrust on him the appliances for a sudden development in all the letters and arts of their own high estate.

This is a fact of amazing significance; and the wonderful activity of the Christian world—Methodists, Congregationalists, Churchmen, Presbyterians, Quakers, Unitarians—from the moment that access could be had to the released slaves, shows more, perhaps, than the religious formulas of the sanctuary, how truly these Christian philanthropists were moved by that Spirit of the divine Master which is expressed in the words, "Freely ye have received: freely give." Their earnest impulse expressed itself in a generous outflow of money and means, as marked as the enthusiasm of the Crusaders, while it had a practical object that made every blow struck result in furthering the process of redemption and development.

As an example of this wonderful activity we turn, first, to the national capital. The District of Columbia had been set off from Maryland, and it was the boast of the revolting States that the city of Washington was on slave territory and surrounded by slave territory. But the representatives of the Southern States had scarcely withdrawn from Congress when it was proposed to emancipate the District slaves, and the act for that purpose went into effect on April 16, 1862. The District then became free territory, and Washington was soon a city of refuge for all the escaped slaves of the surrounding States; and it did not take long to discover that here was a field for patient, persistent, philanthropic Christian work.

The country was then under the strain of the great civil war, and the energies of the North were taxed as they had never been taxed before; but there was no attempt to shirk this new burden, which was borne with a manly strength that savored neither of exhaustion nor fatigue. The increased demands on the Departments, caused by the war, had filled them with an army of clerks fresh from their homes in the North, many of whom were earnest Christian workers, who volunteered their services for evening schools, and benevolent individuals organized day schools and called on their friends to furnish money for their support. An orphans' home was organized for homeless and parentless children; hospitals were established for the sick, in which the spelling book was a part of the medical treat-

ment; and a bewildering multitude of societies, organized for benevolent objects, sent their agents down from the Northern and Western cities to look over the ground and see if there was any remaining want that their energy or resources could supply.

The Emancipation Act took effect in the middle of April, and in the following March the American Tract Society of New York had its agents on the ground, who held a meeting in Duff Green's Row, on Capitol Hill, then crowded with escaped negroes who were held as captured material of war. Rev. H. W. Pierson, for some time President of Cumberland College, Ky., but then in the service of the Tract Society, called the meeting, and there were present some sixty men, women, and children, fresh from Virginia plantations, all eager to learn. Mr. Pierson taught them with printed cards, on which were verses of Scripture in large letters, and he was very successful in gaining their attention and making his first impression.

Then followed a succession of crude efforts in the same direction, by a great variety of influences, growing gradually into a regular and permanent work, but scattered in camps and hospitals, warehouses and colored churches, and at a later period in the villages established for freedmen at Arlington (across the Potomac) and beyond Uniontown, across the Eastern Branch. The school at Freedmen's Village, in the autumn of 1863, was, probably, the most conspicuous example of a genuine school for contraband children, fresh from the plantation, that had then been given to the world. Through the summer the refugees had dwelt there in tents and hovels, or had made their homes under the shelter of some friendly tree or straggling fence; but as the cold weather approached a number of comfortable dwellings were erected by the Government, and also a large but rough building for a school, in which were gathered, at the opening, some two hundred and fifty children, to be soon increased to four hundred. It was conducted by H. E. Simmons and his wife, and attracted the attention of visitors to Washington from all parts of the United States. Mr. Seward and his daughter, Fannie, were constant visitors, and in his visits the Secretary of State was accustomed to take with him foreign ministers and distinguished visitors from abroad, to give them a practical demonstration of the

capacities of the negro in his lowest and most undeveloped condition. The school was a great success from the first, and not only Mr. Seward and his friends, but Secretary Chase, and many Senators and Representatives, were frequent observers of its progress.

But it is not possible in the scope of this article to individualize these various efforts. In the cool months of 1863 and 1864 the various relief associations had under their charge twenty-six schools, with sixty-one teachers and two thousand six hundred and fifty scholars, as is more fully shown by the following table, which we copy from an article published in the First Report of the Commissioner of Education, Henry Barnard, prepared by M. B. Goodwin, Esq. It shows at a glance the part borne in this work at its beginning by the different associations:—

SCHOOLS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS IN 1863, 1864.

| | Schools. | Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Freedmen's Relief Association, Dist. Columbia. | 5 | 11 | 500 |
| American Tract Society, N. Y. | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| African Civilization Society | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| Reformed Presbyterian Mission, (one night school) | 2 | 4 | 200 |
| Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association | 1 | 2 | 150 |
| Philadelphia Friends' Freedmen's Relief Association | 1 | 2 | 150 |
| Dr. L. D. Johnson (one night school) | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Trustees of Colored Public Schools | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| Volunteer Teachers' Association (night schools) | 12 | 34 | 1,250 |
| | 26 | 61 | 2,650 |

The years went on, but the demands for this work did not diminish. In April, 1865, the war was brought to a close, and during the course of the spring and summer the army was disbanded and the camps about Washington broken up; but the city still continued to be a refuge for the emancipated slaves, and as there was more regularity in their modes of living, the change was favorable for the work of education. The schools increased in number and efficiency, and had better quarters, while the agencies through which they were maintained had somewhat changed and gathered new facilities. In the winter of 1864 and 1865 the day schools numbered twenty-nine, the teachers sixty-two, and the scholars three thousand five hundred and eighty-eight; and in the winter of 1865 and 1866 the schools

had increased to forty-two, the teachers to seventy-one, and the scholars to nearly four thousand. But in the mean time the form of the work had greatly changed. New associations had entered the field, with larger means; better accommodations were provided; there was a better supply of books, and the proficiency every-where shown was an encouragement which warranted some arrangements for permanency.

The following table, copied from the same source as the preceding one, is interesting as showing the changes that had taken place in the working force of these educational movements, and the growth and strength which some of the newly enlisted societies were evincing:—

SCHOOLS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS IN 1865, 1866.

| | Schools. | Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Assoc'n, Philadelphia.. | 9 | 17 | 858 |
| New York Freedmen's Relief Association, (N. Y.)..... | 8 | 12 | 604 |
| American Missionary Association, (N. Y.)..... | 8 | 11 | 594 |
| American Baptist Home Missionary Society, (N. Y.).... | 3 | 7 | 284 |
| Philadelphia Friends' Freedmen's Relief Association.... | 2 | 6 | 376 |
| New England Freedmen's Aid Society..... | 4 | 4 | 315 |
| New England Friends' Mission..... | 2 | 3 | 180 |
| Old School Presbyterian Mission, (Pittsburgh)..... | 2 | 5 | 373 |
| Reformed Presbyterian Mission..... | 1 | 3 | 186 |
| African Civilization Society, (N. Y.)..... | 2 | 2 | 108 |
| Bangor Freedmen's Relief Association..... | 1 | 1 | 52 |
| | 42 | 71 | 3,930 |

This does not include the school at Freedmen's Village under the charge of the American Tract Society, nor a number of private schools, nor the evening schools of the Voluntary Teachers' Association. It embraces only the regular day schools of the city which had now acquired some strength, and permanency.

But other influences were already at work, and resulted in great and important changes. The organization of the Freedmen's Bureau, with the vast resources at its command, and with its hand on all influences designed to advance the condition of the freedmen, had an important bearing on colored education. It did not take the work out of the hands of the societies, but in many cases it furnished buildings for the schools, often subsistence to the pupils, and sometimes funds for special school purposes. But its great educational work

was the founding of Howard University, a great central institution, with good buildings, but not so much needed now as it will be in the coming years. The Bureau, while it existed, was every-where the shield and reliance of the negro, and it expended in his behalf—sometimes wisely and sometimes not wisely—the great sum of thirteen millions of dollars.

But more important still, so far as the District of Columbia is concerned, was the action of Congress in providing for a free system of common schools, under a board of trustees which had charge of all the schools, and which in its administration treated all alike. This system was reached after various experiments, and as it advanced to maturity superseded gradually the work of the societies, which, one after another, withdrew from the field. The system, as now existing, contemplates separate schools for colored children, but with the same salaries for teachers and the same general management as the white schools. It has also connected with it a High School and a Normal School for the education of teachers. The number of schools in 1876 was seventy-six, teachers ninety, on roll four thousand five hundred pupils.

The Normal school, known as the "Miner School," is directly connected with the system of public schools, but is maintained by a separate fund, and has a history which admirably illustrates the spirit by which colored education has been achieved. It was founded by Miss Myrtilla Miner a dozen years before the war. She was a single woman of feeble health, and of an obscure family, residing in Brookfield, Madison County, New York, where she was born in 1815. Her parents were engaged in hop culture, and her early life was spent mainly in the work of the farm, and afforded little opportunity for mental culture of any kind. Her constitution was feeble from her birth, and the hard work which was laid upon her aggravated her complaints, and made her long for some lighter occupation. After arriving at womanhood she resolved to break away from home and the work of the farm, and acquire such an education as would fit her for teaching.

Mr. Seward had then just been elected Governor, and she addressed a letter to him, and received a kind and respectful answer, but without opening her way to any opportunity. Not discouraged, she applied in various other directions, and finally

entered the Manual Labor School at Clinton, but found the work beyond her strength. While there she wrote to the principal of a school in Rochester, and made such representations as induced him to offer her the advantages of his school, on a promise of payment after her studies were completed. On completing the required term at Rochester she obtained a place as governess in the family of a planter in the State of Mississippi, where she remained several years, and earned the money to discharge her obligation.

It was during her experience of plantation life that the hardships and ignorance of slavery were first made known to her, calling out occasional reproofs and protests, which she saw were not well received, and which raised suspicions and prejudices that admonished her of the necessity to look elsewhere for the means of living. The idea then first dawned on her mind that she might do something for those poor, degraded, and oppressed creatures, who had no friends and were crushed to the earth by the arm of power. Learning that there were no laws against the education of free colored people in the District of Columbia, she determined to go to Washington and open a seminary for the education of colored girls.

Of course, she had no resources of her own, but she had the confidence of some who had means, and who sympathized with the object in view; and on receiving from a Quaker in Philadelphia a gift of one hundred dollars she proceeded at once to carry into effect her contemplated enterprise. Her school for the education of colored teachers was opened in a room fourteen feet square, in the autumn of 1851; and although she was insulted and persecuted, and driven from place to place, she clung tenaciously to her purpose, and had great success. "You may tear down my house over my head," she said to a party that threatened her, "but I shall get another house. There is no law to prevent my teaching these people, and I shall teach them unto death."

But her experience soon convinced her that she must have a permanent building in some place away from the thickly settled streets; and, finding a square of ground with a building on it that would answer her purpose, for the moderate sum of four thousand dollars, she got assistance from her friends, and bought it; and there her school was continued till near the be-

ginning of the war, when it was suspended on account of her failing health. She went to California, and remained there through the war, returning in 1866, as she supposed to erect better buildings and renew her work under more favorable circumstances. But her health continued to decline, and in December, a few days after reaching Washington, she died. Her project was, however, cherished to the last, and before her death she had her square of ground—containing about three acres, and lying across the street exactly in the rear of the elegant mansion since built by the English Government for the residence of the British Minister—put in the hands of trustees, together with four thousand dollars that she had accumulated to build her house, with an injunction that it should be used to promote the education of colored teachers. The land was sold a few years ago for forty thousand dollars, and the interest has been appropriated for normal education, as she desired. But last year the trustees of the fund, one of whom was Hon. John M. Langston, our Minister to Hayti, resolved to erect a handsome building, and consecrate it to the purposes so near the heart of the heroic founder of the school. That building is just now completed, and the fund remaining will be sufficient, under the arrangements made, to defray the expenses of a first-class school. The building bears on its front the name of its revered founder, and the school is called the Miner School.*

We have occupied considerable space with these Washington schools; but as the operations at the capital are a type of what has taken place at large through all the South, the space has not been wasted. The only remaining institution which it is imperative to notice is the Wayland Seminary, a large and

* This remarkable devotion to the interests of colored education calls to mind the extraordinary benefaction of the late George Peabody. It would be difficult to conceive of any thing which would more exactly touch the great want of the South. The fund admits of the annual distribution of perhaps $100,000, at the discretion of the agent, Rev. Dr. Sears, under the advice and counsel of the distinguished men who act as trustees; and its importance consists largely in the fact that it goes where it is most needed, and where it can do most to stimulate the work of education. Sometimes the help is furnished on condition of other help, sometimes it is to colored schools, sometimes to white schools, and sometimes to promote other educational ends. It is a great and noble gift, intended to advance what Mr. Peabody saw that the South would most need after the changes made by the war; and the help that it yields is not measured by the amount distributed, whatever that may be.

flourishing school, under the care of the Baptist Church, for higher instruction. Its strength at present is in its theological department, which annually equips a large number of young men for the ministry. It occupies a handsome brick building on Meridian Hill, two miles north of the Treasury building, and is doing a splendid work.

Such is the condition of the emancipated slaves at the capital in regard to education, scarcely more than a dozen years after the war which made them free; and if the result is remarkable, it is no more remarkable than what has taken place all over the South. In dealing with education in Washington, the American Missionary Society is incidentally mentioned as having charge of eight schools, with twelve teachers and six hundred and four scholars. It was, in fact, one of the earliest and most persistent of the societies, but did not confine its work to the capital. It seems to have had a sort of mania for this educational enterprise, and wherever the harvest was ripe it thrust in its sickle.

The American Missionary Society was organized in 1846; and, as it came into being during the fierce discussions in regard to slavery that preceded the war, it took on a distinctive anti-slavery character, and was regarded as a virtual protest against the timorous and non-committal course of the American Board. Hence the home department was, from the first, conducted with a special view to preaching a gospel that was free from all complicity with slavery; and it had in 1855 one hundred and ten missionaries in Kentucky, North Carolina, and the North-western States. The history of its work in the slave States is full of romantic interest, but does not come within the scope of this article. Not so with the fact that it had very decisive antislavery tendencies, and had just got into good working order when the war broke out. For, as soon as it appeared how rich the harvest was to be, and how necessary it was to have prompt and decisive action, it withdrew its missionaries from the North-west, and concentrated the whole force of its domestic power, with largely added resources, on the field that had so unexpectedly opened in the South.

The society, thus divested of all embarrassments, was, in fact, prepared to follow the Union armies, and to plant schools wherever the escaped slaves could be protected from the marauding enterprises of the foe. In the first year of the war it

sent one of its missionaries (Rev. L. C. Lockwood) down to Fortress Monroe to look after the homeless and destitute fugitives that were then gathering in large numbers at Hampton; and the abandoned house of Ex-President Tyler was occupied for a Sunday-school on the fifteenth of September, five months after the breaking out of the war. On the day following (the sixteenth) Miss Mary S. Peake opened the first day school for freedmen that was organized in the South, and which was the harbinger of the great multitude that was soon to follow. It was something, too, that it was located on the same coast where, two hundred and forty years before, was landed that cargo of slaves which was the beginning of those oppressions which were now drawing to a close.

The next year more schools were opened at Hampton, two at Newports News, a beginning was made at Port Royal, and a missionary was sent to look after the freedmen gathered in Washington, and another to take care of the fugitives at Cairo. The proclamation of freedom came in January, 1863, and the outlook seemed to justify increased means, which were poured freely into the lap of the association, while many ladies of education and refinement volunteered to occupy the places which opened in such rapid succession.

During the course of the next summer Vicksburgh surrendered and the Mississippi was opened through its entire length, releasing a great army of slaves, and calling for teachers and missionaries at Columbus, Ky., Cairo, Ill., Memphis, Tenn., and the camps of Fisk and Shiloh.

The spring of 1865 saw the close of the war, and the organization of the Freedmen's Bureau. The association did not, however, relax its work, but put forth new energy, and had, at its various stations, 320 teachers actively employed. But now that the war was over it seemed to be necessary that temporary measures should be laid aside, and that arrangements should be made for a permanent occupation of the field; and it was seen that if the work was to be successful it must look, not so much to the masses, great as their need might be, as to the education of teachers and preachers, and the means of promoting a higher and better education, in order that the few thus taught might drop the mantle of instruction on the many that remained untaught. It was evident that if these vast hordes of ignorant slaves, now

slaves no longer, were ever to be lifted from their prison-house, they must become their own educators. Hence the importance of schools for training. The grounds of its action are forcibly stated in the report of 1876. After referring to the fact that the association cannot in the nature of things provide for the common education of the freed people, the report says:—

> Its one aim is and must be to establish at convenient points institutions to prepare Christian workers. These institutions, dotting the South, are the *ganglia*, or nerve centers, from which will radiate in every direction Christian influences. This principle is fundamental to all Christian work. It is the principle which our Lord set forth under the parable of the leaven. It is the principle which has prevailed and must prevail in every kind of missionary enterprise.—Page 10.

In pursuance of this idea this association, which during the war sought opportunity to educate all the released slaves that could be brought under its influence, now bends its efforts almost wholly to the education of "Christian workers;" and to this end has planted training schools, colleges and universities at such central points as to make them most accessible, and to give their influence the widest range. The report says:

> The association the past year has done work such as to awaken thankfulness and courage. It has now in the South seven chartered institutions of learning, fourteen high and normal schools, and six common schools—twenty-seven in all. It sustains 147 teachers and 6,175 pupils, 57 of whom are in theological training.

The effect of this wise seed-sowing has not been miscalculated. The teachers who go out from these institutions are scattered through the South, and, according to the estimate of those most familiar with the facts, now have under their care more than 70,000 pupils; while the preachers, with their greatly improved knowledge, are able to substitute for the wild and loose vagaries of the plantation a religion embracing Christian character.

We have dwelt a little on the history of this pioneer movement—not simply because it was pioneer, nor because it was an outpouring of enthusiastic enterprise, but, also, because it was a type of all that followed. It was a movement in advance, but it was not a movement alone. There was another army of Christian workers just behind it, who were not in a condition to march at the first sound of the trumpet, but who were soon on the way with strong reinforcements. It would be a pleasant

duty, and quite within the scope of this article, to deal separately with each and all of these crusading forces; but as this has already been done in an able article from the pen of Dr. Pearne, in the Quarterly for July, 1877, it is only needful to sum up the account, and show what are the results; and to do this we fall back on the article of Dr. Pearne, whose facts we condense, as follows:—

SCHOOLS OF HIGHER INSTRUCTION.

| | Pupils. | |
|---|---|---|
| **CONGREGATIONAL.** | | |
| Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va. | 243 | |
| Berea College, Berea, Ky. | 237 | |
| Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. | 212 | |
| Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga. | 240 | |
| Talladega College, Talladega, Ala. | 228 | |
| Tougaloo University, Tougaloo, Miss. | 221 | |
| Straight University, New Orleans, La. | 227 | — 1,608 |
| **BAPTIST.** | | |
| Wayland Seminary, Washington, D. C. | 92 | |
| Richmond Institute, Richmond, Va. | 75 | |
| Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C. | 230 | |
| Benedict Institute, Columbia, S. C. | 118 | |
| Augusta Institute, Augusta, Ga. | 52 | |
| Nashville Institute, Nashville, Tenn. | 136 | |
| Leland University, New Orleans, La. | 92 | — 795 |
| **PRESBYTERIAN.** | | |
| Biddle Memorial Institute, Charlotte, N. C. | 124 | |
| Scotia Seminary, (for girls,) Concord, N. C. | 105 | |
| Wallingford Academy, Charleston, S. C. | 261 | |
| Mainerd School, Chester, S. C. | 231 | |
| Fairfield Normal School, Winnsborough, S. C. | 184 | — 905 |
| **METHODIST.** | | |
| Central Tennessee College, Nashville, Tenn. | | |
| Shaw University, Holly Springs, Miss. | | |
| Claflin University and Baker Institute, Orangeburgh, S. C. | | |
| Clarke University and Theological Institute, Atlanta, Ga. | | |
| New Orleans University and Thomson Biblical Institute. | | |
| Wiley University, Marshall, Texas. | | |
| Haven Normal School, Waynesborough, Ga. | | |
| Rust Biblical and Normal Institute, Huntsville, Ala. | | — 1,500 |
| La Teche Seminary, Baldwin, La. | | |
| Bennett Seminary, Greensborough, N. C. | | |
| Richmond Normal School, Richmond, Va. | | |
| Cookman Institute, Jacksonville, Fla. | | |
| Centenary Biblical Institute, Baltimore, Md. | | |
| Orphans' Home, Baldwin, La. | | |
| | | 4,808 |

In this last instance Dr. Pearne does not appear to have taken the pupils from the catalogues, but gives them by estimate; but accuracy is not material to our purpose. What will appear from these figures is the important fact, that in a dozen years after the war there have been planted in these States just out of rebellion more than thirty collegiate schools, in which are annually taught about 5,000 pupils, all trained, and probably all or nearly all maintained, by the Christian philanthropy of the North. This has been done against the wishes, and in many cases against the earnest protests, of the influential classes in the South. During slavery the attitude of those classes was deadly hostile to the education of the negro, and in South Carolina and some other States this was forbidden by law. The statute in South Carolina ran as follows:—

> If any person shall hereafter teach any slave to read or write, or shall aid or assist in teaching any slave to read or write, or cause or procure any slave to be taught to read or write, such person, if a free white person, upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense against this act, be fined not exceeding $100, and imprisoned not more than six months.

But whatever the law might be, the law of society was fatal to this kind of education, and it was not to be expected that the prejudices of a century would be cast off in a day. Hence Northern Christians were obliged to act on their own responsibility; and the coming ages will pronounce how courageously and how nobly they walked up to their duty. The case is well stated in the last (1876) report of the American Missionary Society, already referred to:—

> The question meets us with fearful earnestness: What can be done for the unhappy South? Education and Christianity, and they only, can solve the problem. Not education alone: not Christianity alone, (if such a thing can be,) but education and Christianity combined—an educated Christianity. It is a question worth raising, whether as a matter of self-preservation Congress should not do something for the education of the illiterate masses of the South. But we must not place our dependence on the Government. There are political difficulties in the way which render governmental help in educational directions unlikely, if not impossible. In this emergency Christian people must stand in the breach. As Christians, desiring the salvation of souls; as just men, desiring to protect those whom our own act has put in peculiar danger; as patriots, desiring a united, peaceful, and happy land, we are bound to meet these pressing needs.—Page 10.

It would be too much to expect that these great enterprises should be entirely free from selfish or denominational interests; but how remarkably free they have been would seem to be indicated by their tendency to drop into the hands of local management. All the Washington schools, organized and maintained at so much expense and labor by the various societies, have long since been relinquished and given up to the local school board of the city. The Fisk University, the proudest monument of Northern enterprise in all the South, has gone into the hands of local trustees, and also the Atlanta University in Georgia, and some others; and the Storr School in Atlanta, as is learned from the Atlanta papers, is about to be taken under the wing of the city authorities. It is evident, therefore, that, whatever secondary influences may have operated, the primary object was to redeem and lift up out of his degradation the manumitted slave.

But what would all these provisions amount to if there were not a response on the part of those who were to be benefited? The old saw says that there is no royal road to learning; and if God only helps those that help themselves, it is clear that all expenses of time and money must be in vain if there were not industry and self-denial and persistent adhesiveness on the part of the negro. It is too early as yet to know what education is to do for the negro, but it is not too early to know that he can be educated if he *will*, and that he *will* be educated. The cases of self-denial and perseverance under extraordinary circumstances of poverty and obstruction and opposition are so numerous and so striking as to be an element in those extraordinary results which we have had under review.

This work in the South has been so full of hardships that we wonder how cultivated and refined ladies could leave their pleasant homes in the North and submit to the ostracism, the alarms, and the self-denials that they had to endure. The schools were sometimes broken up by the necessary movements of the army, and the teachers obliged to seek safety in flight; sometimes they were broken up by the persecutions of the planters, or their instruments; sometimes the school-rooms were mobbed or burned; and sometimes the teachers were obliged to fly for their lives. But the work had its bright side, and the teachers clung to it because it was remunerative. The hard

penalties for seeking knowledge were removed, and the lesser penalties were not heeded. Families living in hovels and pinched with hunger came eagerly to the school-house and asked for instruction; and where there is a real want there is a real pleasure in meeting it.

These facts, therefore, answer the question as to whether the negro will be able to help himself—whether he has the perseverance and the self-denial to stand the strain which his circumstances demand to lift himself out of his present condition. But there are other facts that are equally significant, and those which cluster around the origin and development of Fisk University at Nashville are particularly impressive. Here is a large and prosperous institution, with a splendid building and a generous outfit of instructors,* built up and maintained largely by negro genius.

The beginning of this university was not unlike the beginning of many others. There was a great public want, and the university grew up to meet it. In the fall of 1865 Rev. E. P. Smith, afterward Indian Commissioner, but then in the service of the American Missionary Association, and Rev. E. M. Cravath, now President of the university, but then also in the employ of the Association, understanding the wants of the colored people about Nashville, went there to find some suitable place for opening a school, but had great difficulty in obtaining a proper location; and when one was at last found and the owner was approached in regard to it, he said, yes, it was for sale, and he wanted the money, but he "hadn't got so d—d low yet as to sell his property to educate niggers." A further search being made, it was found that an old Government hospital stood on ground that could be bought for $16,000, and as Gen. Fisk, then in the service of the Freedmen's Bu-

* The officers and instructors are as follows: President, Rev. E. M. Cravath, A.M.; Dean and Professor of Greek and French, Rev. A. K. Spence, M.A.; Professor of Theology and German, Rev. H. S. Bennett, M.A.; Professor of Latin, Miss Helen C. Morgan, M.A.; Professor of Natural Science, Rev. F. A. Chase, M.A.; Professor of Music, Theodore F. Seward; Instructor in Mathematics and History, Miss Anna M. Cahill; James D. Burrus, B.A., Instructor in Mathematics; Instructor in English Grammar and Composition, Miss Henrietta Matson; Instructor in Geography, Vocal Music, and Object Lessons, Walker G. Rappleye; Instructor in Arithmetic, Miss Elizabeth M. Barnes; Instructor in English Branches, Miss Sarah A. Stevens; Instructor in Instrumental Music, Miss Rebecca Massey.

reau, would leave the buildings for the use of the school, the purchase was made, and the Missionary Association footed the bill. Gen. Fisk entered heartily into the project, and soon the officers' quarters became the home of a band of teachers, the sick wards were fitted up as school-rooms, the dead house was converted into a store-room, and a pile of rusty hand-cuffs and fetters, bequeathed to the building as a relic of slavery, was sold and converted into spelling-books and Testaments.

The school took the name of General Fisk, a Methodist, and was a great success from the start. The average attendance the first year was over a thousand. In 1867, (the school was opened in January, 1866,) in pursuance of the new policy adopted by the association, a university charter was obtained, and rooms for boarding were extemporized; but when the school was opened under the new management there were more applicants than could obtain quarters. The pupils were all poor, and had to work their way by teaching or other labor, but they clung to their classes with wonderful tenacity, and there was much religious interest and many conversions. But, with all this prosperity, it was every day more and more obvious how unsuited the buildings were for the use of the college, and how pressing was the necessity for more room and better arrangements. The feeling of a great necessity was on all the warm hearts connected with the school, and there was much consultation and prayer, but no way seemed to open for their relief.

In the mean time music, as a part of the college exercises, had been receiving large attention, and under the inspiring instruction of the Treasurer, George L. White, Esq., a native of New York, it had become an important element in the reputation of the university. On several occasions when it was particularly desirable for the school to make a good impression Mr White's classes in music had come to the front and commanded such decided attention and such enthusiastic applause as to make it appear that there was some excellence in their training beyond the usual displays of such occasions.

Mr. White had probably not been aware of his own capacity in that regard, and the applause of these special occasions had inspired him with new confidence, and the idea began to dawn upon him that he might turn his faculty to some account for the benefit of the university. His project, as it finally took

shape, was to collect the old slave melodies of the plantation and the camp-meeting, and render them to the Northern people through his band of singers, with the hope that they would attract the same attention as a band of negro minstrels.

Of the triumphal march of the Jubilee Singers through New England and Old England; of the dollars that they coined to help on the work of education at the University; of the splendid hall which bears their name and is the monument of their genius, we need not speak, though it is a story which touches all hearts; but we should do no justice to our subject if we failed to call attention to the fact that these sweet singers, who have done so much more for the civil rights of their race than any statesman or any law—who have stood before fashionable crowds in all our large cities—who have sung to presidents and governors and cabinet officers, and have commanded the attention of princes and of royalty itself in the proudest nation of the globe, are only selections from that great mass of human merchandise which was brought out of slavery under the chastisements of Lincoln and Grant.

If we go no farther, but take the first name on the list as a type of the rest, we shall come at once into the presence of those sickening abuses which reduced four millions of people to one common level, and well-nigh extinguished the gifts of genius and the royalty of mind. Ella Sheppard was born a slave in the city of Nashville in 1851. Her father, while a slave, had hired his time, and, by economy and toil, had laid up the money to buy his own freedom for $1,800. His wife was owned by a planter in Mississippi, and was carried away from him to that distant State, taking Ella with her. There she was overworked and fell sick, and Ella was near dying of neglect. When the father by accident heard of her condition, he made a journey to Mississippi and bought the child to save its life, and she came with him back to Nashville. He then got together money to buy his wife, but her master refused to sell her, and, as was usual under such circumstances in slavery, he took another wife, who was also a slave, but whose liberty he purchased for $1,300. His family, as now arranged, was, therefore, free; but paying so much money embarrassed him, and, besides, his wife could not get her free papers. Hence she was still a slave, but, as she was the property of her husband,

there was a threat to sell her to pay her husband's debts. To avoid such a calamity he fled to Cincinnati with his wife and child, but with nothing else. Then began new struggles, and when Ella was fifteen years old her father died, and a piano which he had bought for his daughter was sold to pay his debts. But Ella had enjoyed some advantages in Cincinnati, and she found employment as a teacher at six dollars per month, and with this help was studying at the University, when she was chosen to accompany Mr. White.

The gift of song under all these hardships was not concealed; and her history was, in the main, the history of the rest. The whole band, with two or three exceptions, were born in slavery, and when they left Nashville could not find admittance to the most ordinary hotel. At Cincinnati the Commercial announced them as General Fisk's negro minstrels, and they sang in a church and received some encouragement, but their concert failed to pay. And after they left Cincinnati, going northward to Oberlin, and thence to New York, they did not quite meet their expenses, and they often had occasion to repeat with emphasis the words of the slave song:—

> "O, Lord! O, Lord! O, my good Lord!
> Keep me from sinking down!"

At Oberlin they sang with great applause to a convention of Congregational ministers, and received an indorsement which helped them greatly; and Mr. Beecher, in Brooklyn, gave them a hearty welcome and an enthusiastic indorsement, which was borne through the country on the wings of the press; and from that time there was a triumph, and they returned from their New England campaign with $20,000.

The next year their journey through England was a continuous ovation. Just after their arrival in London Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, gave a lunch at his residence to the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal family, and the Jubilee Singers were invited to be present and chant the Lord's Prayer as a grace before meat. They took their position by direction in an alcove, and were quite unnoticed till the sweet and sacred strain fell on the ears of the company, when the attention of all was arrested. Then followed explanations to the advantage of the singers, and they were

asked to sing "John Brown." The Prince of Wales then called for "No more auction block for me," and they were dismissed. Among the guests were the Duke of Sutherland, the Duke and Duchess of Argyle, Earl Granville, Count Munster, Mr. Motley, (then American Minister,) Hon. John Bright, the Bishop of Winchester, (son of the distinguished Wilberforce,) and Mrs. Jenny Lind Goldschmidt, the "Nightingale" of former years, and others less noted. A day or two later a note was received from Mr. Gladstone, in which he said:—

I beg you to accept the assurances of the great pleasure which the Jubilee Singers gave on Monday to our illustrious guests, and to all who heard them. I should wish to offer a little present in books in acknowledgment of their kindness, and in connection with the purposes, as they have announced, of their visit to England. It has occurred to me that, perhaps, they might like to breakfast with us—my family and a few friends—but I would not ask this unless it is thoroughly agreeable to them.

This delicate and characteristic note brought the singers around the table of the Prime Minister of England. Frederick Douglass said on one occasion, while speaking in Dr. Sunderland's church, that it was a long way from the auction-block to the pulpit of a metropolitan church. He might have added, that it was a way which could only be traversed through some divine gift revealed through the instrumentality of culture. It is a long way from the plantation to Mr. Gladstone's table, but it was achieved in this case by the gift of song, developed by education. What stronger proof can we have of educational power?

Rev. Newman Hall, widely known in America, was present as one of the guests at this breakfast, and gave an account of it at the time in the New York Independent. Referring to the American prejudice against the slave color and the insults to which the singers had been subjected on account of it, he said:—

I wish they had been present yesterday, to see Mrs. Gladstone and her daughters, and the noble lords and ladies present, taking their negro friends by the hand, placing them chairs, sitting at their side, pouring out their tea, etc., and conversing with them in a manner utterly free from any approach either to pride or condescension; but exactly as if they had been white people in their own rank in life. And this, not as an effort, nor for the show of it, but from a habit of social intercourse which would have rendered any other conduct impossible.

After the breakfast some time was spent in showing the singers objects of interest among the treasures of art which such a house as Mr. Gladstone's is sure to possess; and when they were all gathered again in the drawing-room, and the guests were about to depart, they were called on to sing, and Mr. Hall's narrative thus continues:—

First, we had "John Brown." I never heard them sing it as they did yesterday. It was not the music alone, but the features of the singers also, which made it so impressive. Their eyes flashed; their countenances told of reverence and joy, and gratitude to God. Never shall I forget Mr. Gladstone's rapt, enthusiastic attention. His form was bent forward, his eyes were riveted, all the intellect and soul of his great nature seemed expressed in his countenance; and when they had finished he kept saying, "Isn't it wonderful! I never heard any thing like it!" The tender thrilling words and music of "O, how I love Jesus!" brought tears to the eyes of the listeners; and when they closed with the Lord's prayer, all the company, led by Mr. Gladstone, reverently stood with bowed heads in worship. Just before leaving the room they sang, "Good-bye, brother; good-bye, sister;" which went to every heart. As brothers and sisters the Premier and Mrs. Gladstone, with their guests, bade them farewell. It was just noon when we passed through the hall, where several persons were waiting on official business to see the Premier, who, doubtless, from that time till late at night was anxiously occupied with public affairs, but whose morning was given up to his negro friends with such heartiness and leisure of mind that a stranger might suppose he was, of all present, the one whose time was most his own.*

* The scene here described recalls a passage in the life of the late William H. Seward. Some time after his election to the Senate, and while he was at his home in Auburn, the rescue of the slave Jerry took place at Syracuse, and a large number of the business men of that city, who were supposed to be engaged in the rescue, were arrested and carried to Auburn, where the United States Court was in session, and arraigned for the offense. They had had no time to employ counsel, or take any measures in reference to the arraignment, and when called to answer were utterly unprepared; but Mr. Seward was in court, and at once offered his services, and it was soon arranged that they should be released on giving bonds for their appearance at a future time. But on looking around the room it was discovered that none of the substantial men of Syracuse were on hand, and on expressing the embarrassment of their position Mr. Seward offered himself as their bail, and he was, of course, accepted, and they were released. He then threw open his house, and invited them to his table to dinner. This took place at the zenith of the abolition excitement, when the name of abolitionist was the most opprobrious epithet that could be pronounced, and, as all the facts were flashed over the United States by telegraph, Mr. Seward was, as he expected to be, the best abused man in the nation. But his generous and noble deportment toward these men, who, in their own view, had committed no crime, was never forgotten either by

We have quoted this passage of history because, as Mr. Jefferson said in the case of Banneker, "it is a document to which the whole color (of the singers) has a right for their justification against the doubts that have been entertained of them." We see from it what development can do for the lowest, and what society loses when it fails to educate the masses of the people. We also see how the negro is to be rescued from public contempt. It is not by any system of forcing, or by virtue of protecting laws or bills of civil rights, however necessary they may be; but by such exhibitions of character, such moral or intellectual qualities, or such displays of genius, as command the public respect. It is not easy to treat with contempt those who "stand before kings." And whenever a gift or endowment is so developed by education as to command the general admiration, it is an inspiration to others, and, therefore, tends to lift up the whole mass.

At the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, the whole population of the United States was not very different in point of numbers from that of the colored population now residing in the Southern States. The country had then been settled for more than 200 years, and there were large interests of production and commerce and government which would seem to demand very liberal provisions for higher institutions of learning. But it may be doubted whether the advantages for education were not inferior to those now possessed by the colored population of the South, after a probation in freedom of scarcely more than a dozen years. The only colleges which appear to have been in existence at that time are in existence still, and can be told by the number of your fingers. They were as follows:—

| Colleges. | When founded. | Graduates. | Average per year. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Harvard | 1638 | 2,567 | 18 |
| William and Mary | 1693 | 496 | 6 |
| Yale | 1701 | 1,405 | 19 |
| New Jersey | 1746 | 567 | 19 |
| Pennsylvania | 1747 | .... | .. |
| Washington and Lee | 1749 | 30 | 1 |
| Columbia | 1754 | 124 | 4 |
| Brown | 1764 | 54 | 5 |
| Dartmouth | 1769 | 43 | 6 |
| Rutgers | 1770 | 13 | 2 |
| Hampden Sidney | 1775 | .... | .. |

the men who were favored or by the men who were maddened. The rescuers were kept under bonds for many years, but never were brought to trial, and Mr. Seward lived to see the fugitive slave law go down in the war which it provoked.

The report of the Commissioner of Education for 1875, from which these figures are derived, also states that the existence of 29 libraries have been traced, containing 3,682 volumes. The library of Fisk University alone is 1,300 volumes, or more than one third of the above sum, and we have seen that there are now in the South, for the benefit of the negro, between 30 and 40 institutions for higher education, with an annual catalogue of nearly 5,000 students; and although they do not, as yet, graduate annually through all the higher departments of learning as many scholars as were graduated from the 10 colleges that were in operation prior to the Revolutionary War, because the training is not for scholarship, but for special work, it seems probable that the educational power is greater and exerts a wider influence.

But whether this is so or not, the result of these brief years of Christian work must be regarded as a phenomenon in the history of the world. It is often said of the movements of our time that they are only history repeating itself; but if there is any thing in history like this generous outpouring of effort and means to redeem a great mass of human merchandise, and lift it up out of its squalor and wretchedness to the level of our common Christian manhood, we exhort the friends of history to produce it.

The new aspect of things in the South under the administration of President Hayes will give a fresh impulse to colored education, and the foundations laid will be even more important than their early promise. At the Georgia constitutional convention last fall there was a very dissatisfied feeling manifested because *foreigners* interested themselves so much about negro education in Georgia, and there was a strong sentiment in favor of taking the matter in hand, and showing that it could be done at home.

During the late visit of the President in the South all the speeches indicated that the feeling in regard to the negro was undergoing a great change. In Atlanta, at the banquet in honor of the President, this change was particularly obvious, and ex-Governor Joseph E. Brown, among other things, said:—

I happen to know that in this city, where we have a public school system, and raise the money for its support by taxation, we have schools for the whites and blacks alike, and the citizens and

wealth of Atlanta are taxed, and have been for years, to educate the colored children, and no complaint is made against it. Not only so, but a college stands over there, (Atlanta University,) and could be seen from this spot but for the intervening buildings, that was originally founded, it is true, by a charitable institution of New England, (American Missionary Association,) but it has been adopted by the State; and, while our Legislature appropriates $8,000 to the State University annually, and has been doing it for many years, it has since 1869 appropriated a like sum of $8,000 annually to this university for colored people, to help build it up. All over Georgia we have a common school system, and we distribute the funds between the children of the races according to numbers. We feel that it is our duty to do justice to them, and, since they are made our fellow-citizens, to make them the best citizens that we can. We pledge you (speaking to the President) that we will do as much for them as you can do, and as much as in your section is done for the lower classes in your society.

If this spirit is generally to prevail in the South we may be assured that it will not be long before all these institutions, planted by Northern Christian benevolence, will be, as Governor Brown expresses it, adopted by the States in which they are located, and perhaps be their pride and glory. But whatever may happen, the history of this movement, both in its generous purposes and its magnificent results, must ever rank among the noblest achievements of modern Christian enterprise.

## Art. IV.—THE BLUE LAW FORGERIES OF REV. SAMUEL PETERS.

*The True-Blue Laws of Connecticut and New Haven, and the False Blue-Laws invented by the Rev. Samuel Peters.* To which are added specimens of the Laws and Judicial Proceedings of other Colonies, and some Blue-Laws of England in the reign of James I. Edited by J. Hammond Trumbull. 12mo., pp. 360. Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Company. 1876.

*The Rev. Samuel Peters', LL.D., General History of Connecticut, from its first settlement under George Fenwick, to its latest period of amity with Great Britain prior to the Revolution;* including a description of the country, and many curious and interesting anecdotes. With an Appendix, pointing out the causes of the rebellion in America; together with the particular part taken by the people of Connecticut in its promotion. By a gentleman of the Province. London. 1781. To which are added, additions to appendix, notes, and extracts from letters, verifying many important statements made by the author. By Samuel Jarvis McCormick. 12mo., pp. 285. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1877.

There is a very general impression throughout the country, even among people otherwise well informed, that the early set-

tlers of the colony of New Haven, which was afterward incorporated with the Colony of Connecticut, were characterized by peculiarly narrow views. It is supposed that these views were so narrow that under their influence the colonists were led to a course of legislation in which the element of the ludicrous was conspicuous. In particular, it is believed that there was a law in force, according to which it was made a criminal offense for a woman to kiss her child on Sunday; and that the laws in other respects were so minute in their provisions, so exacting in their requirements, and so severe in their penalties, that they received from the people of the neighboring colonies the name of "Blue Laws."

Now, all this is an entire mistake. Strange as it may seem, the colony which had, perhaps, the least in its legislation of minute interference with the personal concerns of individuals is the one which, in popular estimation, has been made accountable for all the idle stories about the strictness and severity of the Puritans which have been set afloat by their enemies.

In order to place before our readers the means of forming an opinion for themselves on this subject, and to explain the way in which these stories originated, it will be necessary to give some account of the people who settled New Haven, of the objects which they had in view, and of the methods which they took to secure them. It will be seen that such absurd legislation, as it is believed these men attempted, is entirely inconsistent with their character.

It should be understood, then, that the colonists who established themselves in New Haven in 1638 were, for the most part, from the city of London. Their leaders had been engaged there in extensive commercial operations, had discharged important public trusts, and had enjoyed high social position. They were distinguished among all the colonists who came to any part of the country for their superior culture, their wealth, their knowledge of affairs, the largeness of their views, and the greatness of the plans which they proposed to themselves. Not to speak of others of reputation, Governor Eaton had represented his sovereign, Charles I., at the court of Denmark. Governor Hopkins had been successful as a merchant in trade with the countries situated on the Baltic. John Davenport was one of the ablest of the contemporary clergymen of London, who was

never forgotten by his countrymen in his distant home in the wilderness, but continued to be recognized in England, as long as he lived, as one of the most learned and one of the wisest in counsel of all the Puritan clergy on either side of the Atlantic.

These men were the first body of colonists who left England with a definite plan of establishing an independent State on these shores. The views which prevailed at that time in England with regard to the nature and objects of civil government were those which were afterward reduced to system by Sir Robert Filmer. The theory which was accepted was that, by the law of God, all legitimate authority resides in the king; and that there is no other power in the State which can limit him in the exercise of his prerogative; that all his rights, in accordance with the idea of the patriarchal regimen of families, devolve on his death to his heir; each next heir being always king by divine right, and as incapable of being restrained in his sovereignty as of being excluded from it. The doctrine was held—more comprehensive and more monstrous even than that of the Dred Scott decision—which so shocked the moral sense of the American people, *that no subject has any positive rights in behalf of which he may "decline illegal requisitions."* Sir Robert Filmer declared that a subject is "bound to obey the king's command against law, nay, in some cases, against divine laws." Preachers were rewarded and advanced in position for proclaiming that "the king might take the subject's money at his pleasure, and that no one might refuse his demand on penalty of damnation." There could be no lawful resistance to the king. The University of Oxford pronounced a solemen decree that it is in no case lawful for subjects to make use of force against their princes; and all persons promoted to degrees were compelled to subscribe to this article. A little later this same university anathematized as "false, seditious, and impious," the doctrine that civil authority is derived from the people. Furthermore, there could be no release from this thralldom. The subject could not divest himself of the allegiance which he owed to the Lord's anointed. As long as he had life he was amenable to the despotic power of the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission.

Now, the Puritan party in England had begun to oppose

these claims. But even the men who had left England to make new homes beyond the ocean had not disentangled themselves entirely from the old traditions. The constitution which was framed in the cabin of the Mayflower marks a new epoch in the history of constitutional government. Yet those men supposed themselves to be still under English rule. They did not desire to shake it off. They subscribed themselves "the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign, King James," and what they did they declared was done for the "honor of our king and country." The colonists who settled Massachusetts made no progress in theory upon the men of Plymouth. They went out from England under English charters. Their claim to the rights which they asserted was founded in their estimation on the fact that they were free-born Englishmen. The colonists, also, who settled the river towns on the Connecticut did not develop their views till after they had been for some time in this country, and had shared for years the fortunes of the Massachusetts Colony.

It should be remembered, then, that, at a time when these views were every-where accepted, the colony which left England under the leadership of John Davenport and Governor Eaton was formed in London for the express purpose of establishing an independent State on these shores. They claimed that there were rights which were theirs, not because they were Englishmen, but because they were *men*. They fell back on the natural and inherent right which belonged to them by virtue of their manhood. They discarded entirely all allegiance to the Stuarts. They claimed that if they went beyond the limits of any existing English government they were free to expatriate themselves and found a new and independent State. They determined to establish themselves in the American wilderness, without asking for any charter. It was their plan to establish a State, by mutual agreement, beyond the reach of English authority, and without any reference of any kind whatever, express or implied, to the government of the king. They proposed to found a State which should be independent; a State whose professed object should be the "common welfare of all;" a State, moreover, which should be supported and adorned as soon as possible by all those institutions which the wide experience of their leaders in different lands had taught them would give it dignity and

strength, and contribute to the well-being of its citizens. Here, then, is to be found the origin of the peculiar hatred with which the colony of New Haven was regarded from the very first by all the friends of absolute power in Church and State, both in America and in England.

We have said that the chief men among the colonists who settled New Haven had been engaged at home in commercial pursuits. They had been accustomed to conduct enterprises on a large scale with the people of distant countries. It was their plan to build up in America an important commercial city by means of foreign trade. Their enlarged views are seen in the foresight which they manifested in laying out their new town. There was nothing like it on the American continent. Compare the crooked, narrow, hap-hazard lanes, following the cow-paths, and hardly worthy of the name of streets, which still survive in all the older parts of the first towns which were built in other places, with the broad, convenient, and well-ordered streets of New Haven, and it will be seen at once that these men understood what a city is, and how it should be laid out. The commendation now bestowed on the "City of Elms" is no new thing. One of the oldest historians says, that "it outdid the rest of the country in fair and stately houses." Another writer says, "the houses in Boston make a poor show" when compared with those in New Haven. For more than two hundred years similar praises have been heard. Its beauty has, probably, done more to cultivate the taste and give direction in the laying out of all subsequent American towns and cities than any other town in the United States.

The broad views of these founders of New Haven are still further shown by the regard which they paid to education. It was a part of their original plan that provision should be made for universal education. General intelligence was to be the foundation on which their little commonwealth was to rest. One of the first things done by the General Court, at the very time that they were taxing themselves for laying out the town and preparing the means of defense against the savages, was to establish a public school for the instruction of youth; and a committee was appointed to consider "what yearly allowance is meet to be given to it out of the common stock of the town."

And scarcely a twelvemonth had passed from the day of landing when an entry appears in the records of the town, to this effect: "That Thomas Fugill is required to keep Charles Higginson, an indented apprentice, at school one year, or else to advantage him as much in his education as a year's learning comes to." Professor Kingsley says: "Charles Higginson was probably the first apprentice indentured in the colony, and this condition of his apprenticeship was recorded undoubtedly as an example of privileges to be granted to all in the same circumstances. Here is a proceeding which marks, as distinctly as any measure could, the views entertained by the leaders of the colony of the value of education, the protection which ought to be extended to the indigent, and their regard for popular rights. If any one hereafter shall wish to inspect the early colonial records of New Haven to find subjects of reproach or merriment, let him be referred to the entry of the indenture of Charles Higginson. If all the ridiculous and absurd reports which have been circulated about the New Haven laws were founded in fact, this single record, in the opinion of the intelligent and unprejudiced, would throw them at once into the shade. Such a course of policy as is here unfolded, such charity for a class of the community at that time, and still under every European Government, but little regarded, would cover a multitude of sins. No suggestion for the adoption of a rule by which an elementary education was secured to apprentices could have been received from any law of the parent country. No Act of Parliament, it is believed, embracing such a provision, exists in England, with all its improvement and wealth, to the present day."

The views of these men were not limited to securing the advantages of a common-school education to all. It was a part of their original plan, also, to have a Latin school, a college, and a public library. They brought with them a professional classical teacher, Mr. Ezekiel Cheever, whose "Latin Accidence" held its place for more than a century as the accepted text-book in Latin grammar. As early as 1647, the tenth year of the settlement, they began to take definite action with regard to establishing a college, which, in their estimation, was to crown their educational system. Land was then formally set apart for its support. In 1664, the college was actually "set up," but in consequence of the disheartening effect of the

failure of the commercial projects of the colonists, their college never rose above the grade of a Latin school; but it prepared the way for the University which is now known by the name of Yale, which is the direct offspring of the wise plans of the original settlers.

We call attention now to the manner in which the neighboring Indians were treated by the New Haven colony. Dr. Bacon asserts that "New Haven was distinguished among the colonies of the New England confederation for scrupulous justice" towards them. He continues: "How often and how justly has Penn been lauded for the fact that under his administration his colony had no collision with the Indians! and is not the same praise due to the civil and religious leaders of the New Haven colony, for the parallel fact that the relations between New Haven and the wild tribes around were always those of perfect amity?" The Indians of the neighborhood, as all the records show, looked upon their English neighbors as their protectors. When one of them felt himself wronged by the white men he came to the courts here with his complaint as freely as if he were a citizen. The testimony of an Indian was good against a white man. Again and again white men were found guilty and punished on no other testimony. The white man who wronged an Indian was punished the more severely, as his conduct tended to prejudice the heathen against the Gospel and to cause the name of God to be blasphemed among the Gentiles. The Indian who was found guilty of an offense was treated the more gently because of his ignorance, and, being dismissed with such punishment as the rules of righteousness seemed to require in such a case, was told that had he been an Englishman he would not have come off so easily. All the maligners of the Puritans may be defied to show that one rood of ground within their colony was achieved otherwise than by a free, fair bargain, and equitable payment.

The wisdom of these men further appears in the fact, that arriving in New Haven, they were in no haste to make any special code of laws. As might be expected, they found a great deal to do. Although they claimed to be a State, they might very properly be regarded as a large family. They were, in fact, a party of old acquaintances and friends, members of the same Church, who had established themselves in the wilder-

ness. Besides the difficulty of forming a code of laws adapted to their new condition, when they were occupied with so many cares, there was a difficulty of a political nature. They had reason to apprehend that any recognition of the laws of England, however qualified, might lead to the introduction of English supremacy and their own ultimate subjection to the very tyranny from which they had fled. Accordingly, they agreed for the present that they would be "governed by the rules held forth in Scripture;" and magistrates were appointed—men of character, in whose wisdom they had confidence—who were empowered to render judgment in all cases which should come before them in accordance with these "rules held forth in Scripture" and the dictates of reason. There is danger that in this nineteenth century we may forget what a great step in advance the New Haven colonists made when they incorporated this idea into the constitution of their young republic. At home the extreme doctrine, as we have already said, was openly avowed, and applauded by the Court, "that if princes commanded any thing which subjects might not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without resisting, or railing, or reviling, and so to yield a passive obedience when they cannot yield an active one." In opposition to all such views, the purpose of these men was to found a Christian State, where the object should be not to satisfy the whims of a king, but "to secure the common welfare of all," as they expressed it; and where their "common welfare" was to be sought by making the word of God as it is found in the Bible the foundation of all legislation. Or, as Dr. Bacon has said, "Christianity—the ethics of Christianity—was to be the constitution of the commonwealth, the supreme law of the land."

Five years passed away, and the system was found to work well. The planters were still too much occupied to draw up a formal code adapted to their new wants, and it was, therefore, ordered by the General Court, in 1644, "that the judicial laws of God as they were delivered by Moses, and as they are a fence to the moral law, *being neither typical nor ceremonial, nor having any reference to Canaan*, shall be a rule to all the courts in this jurisdiction in their proceedings against offenders *till they be branched out into particulars hereafter*." The de-

cision of the duly appointed magistrates, and all the proceedings of the courts from the first, were recorded in full at the time, and have been accurately printed and are everywhere easily accessible; and for their general conformity with the "dictates of wisdom" have won the applause of the ablest jurists and the most profound students of our early history. In illustration of the wisdom of the course of their early legislation, Dr. Bacon, in his "Historical Discourses," says:—

Remember now that, situated as they were, they must adopt either the laws of England or some other known system—a system entirely new they could not frame immediately. Should they, then, adopt the laws of England as the laws of their young Republic? Those were the very laws from which they had fled. Those laws would subject them at once to the king, to the Parliament, and to the prelates in their several jurisdictions. The adoption of the laws of England would have been fatal to the object of their emigration. Should they then adopt the Roman civil law, which is the basis of the jurisprudence of most countries in Europe? That system is foreign to the genius of Englishmen, and to the spirit of freedom, and, besides, was unknown to the body of the people for whom laws were to be provided. What other course remained to them, if they wished to separate themselves from the power of the enemies who had driven them into banishment, and to provide for a complete and vital independence, but to adopt at once a system of laws which was in every man's hand, which every man read, and, as he was able, expounded in his family, and with which every subject of the jurisdiction could easily be made familiarly acquainted?

And what was there of absurdity in this code, considered as a code for just such a settlement as this was? Where are we, that we need to raise such a question? Is it in a Christian country that the question must be argued, whether the Mosaic law, excluding whatever is typical, or ceremonial, or local, is absurd, as the basis or beginning of a system of jurisprudence? Suppose the planters of Quinnipiack had taken as their rule, in the administration of justice, the laws of Solon, or Lycurgus, or the laws of the twelve tables: suppose the agreement had been, that the laws of King Alfred should be followed in the punishment of offenders, in the settlement of controversies between individuals, and in the division of estates—where had been the absurdity? Who will tell us that the laws of Moses are less wise or equitable than the laws of any other of the legislators of antiquity?

The laws of Moses were given to a community emigrating from their native country, into a land which they were to acquire and occupy for the great purpose of maintaining in simplicity and purity the worship of the one true God. The founders of this colony came hither for the self-same purpose. Their emigration from

their native country was a religious emigration. Every other interest of their community was held subordinate to the purity of their religious faith and practice. So far, then, as this point of comparison is concerned, the laws which were given to Israel in the wilderness may have been suited to the wants of a religious colony planting itself in America.

The laws of Moses were given to a people who were to live not only surrounded by heathen tribes on every frontier save the seaboard, but also with heathen inhabitants, worshipers of the devil, intermixed among them, not fellow-citizens, but men of another and barbarous race; and the laws were, therefore, framed with a special reference to the corrupting influence of such neighborhood and intercourse. Similar to this was the condition of our fathers. The Canaanite was in the land, with his barbarian vices, with his heathenish and hideous superstitions; and their servants and children were to be guarded against the contamination of intercourse with beings so degraded.

The laws of the Hebrews were designed for a free people. Under those laws, so unlike all the institutions of Oriental despotism, there was no absolute power, and, with the exception of the hereditary priesthood, whose privileges as a class were well balanced by their labors and disabilities, no privileged classes. The aim of those laws was "equal and exact justice;" and equal and exact justice is the only freedom. Equal and exact justice in the laws, and in the administration of the laws, infuses freedom into the being of a people, secures the widest and most useful distribution of the means of enjoyment, and affords scope for the activity, and healthful stimulus to the affections of every individual. The people whose habits and sentiments are formed under such an administration of justice will be a free people.

But it is worth our while to notice two of the most important effects of their renouncing the laws of England, and adopting the Mosaic law. In the first place, the principle on which inheritances were to be divided was materially changed. In England the usage prevailed of giving all real estate to the eldest son. This is the pillar of the English aristocracy. Let this one principle be taken away; let estates, instead of passing undivided to a single heir, be divided among many heirs, and that vast accummulation of wealth in the hands of a few great families is at an end. But the Jewish law divides inheritances among all the children, giving to the eldest son, as the head of the family, only a double portion. This promotes equality among the people, breaking up the rich man's great estate into as many portions as he has children, and thus insuring the constant division and general distribution of property. How different is the aspect of this country now from what it would have been, if the feudal law of inheritance had been from the beginning the law of the land! How incalculable has been the effect on the character of the people!

Notice, in the next place, how great a change, in respect to the inflicting of capital punishments, was made by adopting the He-

brew laws, instead of the laws of England. By the laws of England more than one hundred and fifty crimes were, till quite lately, punishable with death. By the laws which the New England colonists adopted, this bloody catalogue was reduced to eleven. On such a difference as this it would be idle to expatiate. In determining what kind of men our fathers were, we are to compare their laws, not with ours, but with the laws which they renounced. The greatest and boldest improvement which has been made in criminal jurisprudence, by any one act, since the dark ages, was that which was made by our fathers, when they determined, "that the judicial laws of God, as they were delivered by Moses, and as they are a fence to the moral law, being neither typical, nor ceremonial, nor having any reference to Canaan, shall be accounted of moral equity, and generally bind all offenders, and be a rule to all the courts." Whatever improvements in this respect we have made since their day may be resolved into this: We have learned to distinguish better than they between that in the laws of Moses which was of absolute obligation, being founded on permanent and universal reasons only, and that which was ordained in reference to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew nation, and which was therefore temporary or local.

What manner of men these colonists were appears, also, from the fact that in eighteen successive annual elections they chose such a man as Theophilus Eaton to be their chief magistrate. Dr. Bacon says, as the result of his study of the services of Governor Eaton: "I have acquired new views of the dignity which belongs to the place of the civil magistrate." Hubbard, the historian of Massachusetts, who was one of his contemporaries, says:—

> This man had in him great gifts, and as many excellences as are usually found in any one man. He had an excellent princely face and port, commanding respect from all others. He was a good scholar, a traveler, a great reader; of an exceeding steady and even spirit, not easily moved to passion, and standing unshaken in his principles when once fixed upon; of a profound judgment, full of majesty and authority in his judicatures, so that it was a vain thing to offer to brave him out; and yet, in his ordinary conversation, and among friends, of such pleasantness of behavior, and such felicity and fecundity of harmless wit, as can hardly be paralleled.

Mather describes him as he appeared at home: "In the government of his family he was prudent, serious, happy to a wonder; and albeit he sometimes had a large family, consisting of no less than thirty persons, yet he managed them with such an even temper that observers have affirmed they never saw a

house ordered with more wisdom." "He kept," we are told, an honorable and hospitable table." It may not be out of place to mention, in this connection, that in the inventory of his estate after his death we find mentioned "plate" to an amount considerably above one hundred pounds sterling, without taking into the account other articles in silver, of the value of forty pounds sterling, which Mrs. Eaton claimed "as her proper estate." His "wearing apparel," not including jewelry, which is set down by itself, is inventoried at fifty pounds sterling. There is mention made of "the green chamber," with a "cypress chest," the "blue chamber," and various other rooms and "chambers," with abundant furnishing; the "hall," with its drawing table, round table, green cushions, great chair with needle-work, high chairs and high stools, low chairs and low stools, Turkey carpet, high-wine stools, great brass andirons, together with books, and a globe, and a map, which last are inventoried at about fifty pounds, all which show, in the words of an old historian, that, notwithstanding the failure of his commercial plans, the governor maintained a port in some measure answerable to his place. Yet, we are told, "he countenanced the addresses to himself of the children and servants with any of their inquiries." One of his servants could say many years after his master's death: "Whatever difficulty in my daily walk I now meet withal, still something that I either saw or heard in my blessed master Eaton's conversation helped me through it all." Now, an intelligent and independent community who could appreciate for so long a period the virtues of such a chief magistrate, were, without doubt, themselves possessed in no small degree of the same virtues. This exhibition of mutual confidence is creditable to both.

This, then, has been our object thus far, to show that the character of the colonists who settled New Haven, and especially the character of their distinguished leaders, was such that it is impossible that there could have been any such ridiculous legislation, as it is believed they were responsible for. We have already said that the records of the courts, and of all the public proceedings of the colony, remain in perfect preservation to this day, and that they have been published, and are easily accessible. We do not claim that there was no legislation which, in the light of the nineteenth century, does not seem

unwise. The colonists were Englishmen of the seventeenth century, and were still swayed in many things by the traditions of their age and of their country. But we do claim that they were distinguished from all the other colonists by the fact that they avoided many of their serious errors, and especially that in their legislation they were free from what their calumniators have been disposed to characterize as "the ludicrous."

But our work will not be done till we give an explanation of the way in which this libel about the "Blue Laws" originated. This explanation the writer of this article suggested some years ago, and it has been accepted by some of the best students of the history of those times.

But, in order to understand it, it will be necessary to pass to a period nearly a hundred years distant from the settlement of New Haven, to a time when it had become incorporated with the Colony of Connecticut. The colony, too, which had been established at the mouth of the Hudson River, under the auspices of the Dutch West India Company, had come under the control of the English crown. The state of things which ensued has been so well described by Dr. Bacon that we transfer a brief quotation to our pages:—

> Already the Church of England was virtually the established Church in that province. . . . It was also well understood that to bring the New England colonies into an ecclesiastical conformity with England would greatly promote their loyalty, and the permanence of their dependence on the crown. The royal governors of New York were, therefore, doing whatever in their power they could do to show that the English conquest of that province from the Dutch had brought in the Church of England; and that English ascendency was the ascendency of the English Prayer Book and the English hierarchy, no less than of the English language. . . . From the moment that New Amsterdam became New York, the royal power, with the pomp and prestige attendant on a royal government, was nearer to Connecticut than it had ever been before. The almost independent self-government instituted by the founders of the colony, and confirmed by a charter from King Charles II., had become precarious. Its dissolution, and the reduction of the people into an immediate and entire dependence on the crown, were confidently expected by all malcontents, and eagerly helped on by those who thought that under royal governors like Andros and Cornbury the chances for them would be better than under the self-government of a Puritan people.

The "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" was meanwhile established in England to help on this important work. Under its direction missionaries of the Church of England entered New England at the nearest point, which was, of course, Connecticut; and a few congregations were gathered by them in different places in the colony.

It is very natural that, under these circumstances, mutual jealousies should spring up. The people of Connecticut, who had been for two or three generations on the soil, were simple in their manners, strongly attached to the faith of their fathers, and proud of the liberties which they enjoyed under their charter. The English emigrants who had been attracted to the newly-acquired province of New York were generally in hearty sympathy in their religious views with the most extreme claims of the High-Church party, and in politics were Tories. When they left home, the Puritan party, which had done so much for the liberties of England, was in disgrace. Its principles were flouted at. All manner of ridicule was heaped upon every thing and every body belonging to it. Even if these emigrants had any of them been moderate in their views at home, the tendency, when once in New York under the rule of a royal governor, was to magnify more and more all the institutions of their native land, and especially the power and the dignity of the king, from whom was to come all favor and advancement; and in the same way to despise those sturdy republican neighbors with whom they were not unfrequently brought into collision, and whom they found so contented with their independence and their self-government.

Now, it is to be remembered that in those days, when all traveling was attended with every kind of difficulty, New Haven—which was the nearest town of importance, and the one with which they had most to do—was to them practically "New England." It was the part of New England about which they knew the most, and that part of it which they pictured to themselves whenever "New England" was spoken of.

So it came about that all the stories, true or false, which in any way redounded to the discredit of the descendants of the Puritans anywhere throughout all New England, were at once, in the common apprehension of the people of New York

and of all those in other places who possessed the same sympathies, attached to New Haven; and this colony was made to bear the burden. And when these advocates of arbitrary and hereditary rights learned, as they soon did, the early history of New Haven; and found that—in accordance with the principles afterward avowed in the "Declaration" of 1776—an independent government had once been set up here by voluntary compact; and that those who did it had done so with the belief that their own elected magistrates had "as perfect an authority to exercise all the functions of government as any potentate on earth," they were astounded at the "bigotry" and the "fanaticism" displayed! "The doctrine that the majesty of a State, with laws and powers ordained of God, could spring into being by the lifting up of the hands of a few exiles under the rafters of a barn, with no sanction of papal bull or royal charter," inspired them with bitter and relentless hatred. Henceforth they could believe any stories about this Puritan city, however absurd!

Massachusetts and Plymouth were too far removed from their range of vision for any thing about either of them, even though it were true, to remain long in their memories connected with those particular colonies. If they heard of the enactment in a former age of sumptuary laws in those distant regions, or laws with regard to tobacco, or laws in regulation of the dress of females, they soon forgot the locality, and fell into the habit of laying them to the charge of New Haven, where it is to be always remembered *there was never any thing of the kind!* New Haven was situated on the frontier, and had to take the brunt of every thing.

But the spirit of independence was rapidly spreading. Mr. Bancroft tells us that after a time even the "bigoted royalists of New York began to vie with New England" in their efforts for "a liberal constitution." The opening days of the Revolution dawned, and now was seen at last the triumph of those principles so long misunderstood, and so long derided, to establish which John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton left their homes and braved all the terrors of the wilderness in 1638.

But there were royalists in the different colonies, as is well known, who could have no sympathy with what they felt to be

the frenzy which had impelled the American people to cast off their allegiance to Great Britain. Among them were some of the most respected persons in the country, for whose conscientious convictions we feel all proper respect. There were others whose conduct in that crisis has justly excited universal contempt. Among the number of those included in the last class is Rev. Samuel Peters, who, at the commencement of the Revolutionary War was an Episcopal missionary in Hebron, Connecticut. As he was very active in asserting the royal claims, he became obnoxious to the patriots of the day, and was threatened by a mob, though it is believed no serious personal violence was done him. About 1774 he went to England, highly exasperated against his country, and especially against his native State. He employed himself, while the war continued, in reviling the colonists in the papers of the time, and in 1781 published in London, without his name, a "History of Connecticut." In this "History," were collected all the extravagant stories that had been set afloat during the previous fifty years to gratify the stupidity of those among the lower classes in New York who were descended from the Dutch, or the hatred of the most bitter of the British royalists. This "History" it is which is the "authority" for the "Blue Laws," which were attributed to the New Haven colonists.

Some of these laws are as follows:—

No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting-day.

No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath-day.

No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in the garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

Whoever wears cloaths, trimmed with gold, silver, or bone lace, above two shillings by the yard, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the selectmen shall tax the offender £300 estate.

No one shall read Common Prayer, keep Christmas or Saints' days, make mince pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, trumpet, and jews'-harp.

Every male shall have his hair cut round, according to a cap.

According to Mr. Peters, these laws were by no means confined to New Haven. His explicit statement is, that "similar laws still prevail over New England as the common law of the country!" (*That is, less than a hundred years ago, in* 1781.)

Professor Kingsley says, ("Historical Discourse," page 84:)

When this work first appeared, its extravagances and falsehoods were so apparent and gross, that any attempt to contradict or expose them was considered unnecessary and superfluous. The work was evidently designed chiefly, to render the people of Connecticut odious and despicable abroad; but its abuse was so outrageous, and its statements so opposed to the most notorious facts, that even with respect to foreigners, it was thought to need no refutation. There were, however, in Connecticut, at the time this pretended History appeared, individuals who sympathized strongly with its author. They had cherished the same antipathies and resentments as Peters himself; and as the English interest declined in the United States, they were glad to seize even upon such support as this miserable farrago afforded them. Its stories were to their taste; and they repeated them so often as apparently to create in themselves a sort of belief in the truth of some of them. The credit, however, acquired by this work was never extensive; and its real character has been generally too well understood to call for direct animadversion. Dr. Trumbull once told me, in reply to the question, why, in his "History of Connecticut," he had made no allusion to this work of Dr. Peters—that he had considered a reference to it as wholly unnecessary; since any one, on very slight examination, would see that it was refuted in so many of its statements by indubitable public documents, that it could gain no credit. He said that he had been well acquainted with Dr. Peters from very early life (I think he stated that they were both natives of Hebron), that they were contemporary in college (Dr. Peters graduated at Yale College in 1757, Dr. Trumbull in 1759), and that an occasional intercourse between them had been maintained till Dr. Peters went to England in 1774. He added, that of all men with whom he had ever been acquainted, Dr. Peters, he had thought, from his first knowledge of him, the least to be depended upon as to any matter of fact; especially "in story-telling."

According to Mr. Peters, the epithet "blue" was applied to the laws of New Haven because they were thought to be peculiarly sanguinary; and he says "blue" is here equivalent to "bloody." He says: "They were all sanctified with excommunication, confiscation, fines, banishment, whippings, cutting off the ears, burning the tongue, and death." In answer to all this, it is enough to refer to what has already been stated in this article, that while, according to the laws of England, one hundred and fifty crimes were punishable with death, the catalogue was reduced at once in New Haven to fourteen or fifteen.

As we have said, the only authority for the "blue laws" is this Mr. Peters. We do not propose to spend many words upon him. He was a man who was utterly incapable of tell-

ing the truth on any subject. His so-called "History" was the malicious libel of a Tory refugee in England, at a time of war, who was receiving a pension from the ministry, and was hoping to gain further favor by vilifying his native State. When it was published, it was said at once in London that it bore "so many marks of party spleen and idle credulity that it was altogether unworthy of the public attention." Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, formerly Secretary of State of Connecticut, than whom no one is better acquainted with the history of Connecticut, says there are not six consecutive sentences in the book which are not open to criticism. It is filled with stories which would not be out of place in the Travels of the Baron Munchausen. We have space only to refer, simply as specimens, to Mr. Peters' description of an army of caterpillars who "came in one night" and "covered the earth, on both sides of the Connecticut river, to an extent of three miles in length and two in depth;" to his story about the "Windham frogs," who filled a road forty rods wide and four miles in length; to his account of the falls of the Connecticut river, which are known as Bellows' Falls, where the water is set back, and spreads over the meadows twenty-four miles wide, and is at the same time so deep that ships of war may sail there; to his description of the "Indian paw-waw" at Stratford, where devils were seen to seize several persons and "to mount with them into the air;" to his statement that the Rev. George Whitefield, in 1740, attempted to "bring down" the walls of the fort at Saybrook by prayer, while he walked seven times around them, in imitation of Joshua at Jericho, to the sound of rams' horns; to his claim that Yale College was founded by one of his ancestors; to his story of the Grigson will case in New Haven. His exaggerations even of things with which he must have been perfectly familiar are amazing! The malice with which he wrote is especially apparent in his statement that the Rev. Thomas Hooker, of Hartford, one of the saints of his time, in order to get possession of the lands of an Indian king by the name of Connecticote, who, it may be mentioned in passing, is an altogether mythical character, communicated the small-pox to him by means of a Bible which he presented to him, the leaves of which were poisoned with the virus. Any one who now offers the statements of Mr. Peters to prove any thing

whatever makes himself ridiculous. But it was not only in his "History" that his falsehoods abound. In the periodicals of the day he lied about his ancestors, he lied about his wife, he lied about himself. Every time public attention is turned to him some new falsehood of his comes to light. Quite recently it has been almost, if not quite, proved that he lied about the degree of Doctor of Laws which he claimed to have received from an institution in Cortona in Tuscany! And yet this collection of absurd falsehoods, called a "History," has been taken up by the enemies of the Puritans because it furnishes them with convenient weapons of ridicule, and has served to obscure the reputation of some of the best and the noblest men who have ever lived on the American continent.

It is to be remembered that what a nation has most to be proud of is not its material wealth, the length of its rivers, the fertility of its soil, the treasures in its mines; it is the men who have best advanced its interests, and left the example of an honorable life to those who come after them. The political or ecclesiastical partisan, then, who deliberately seeks to depreciate and vilify the characters of those who have rendered important services to their country, robs the nation of its richest treasure, and deserves to be ever remembered with scorn.

There still remains that we should say a few words about the books whose titles we have placed at the head of this paper.

Hon. J. Hammond Trumbull, one of the best informed and most careful historical students in the country, has brought together in the first, within the compass of some three hundred duodecimo pages, all the material which will enable any one in a few moments to form an independent opinion with regard to the authenticity of the code of laws which Mr. Peters has given in his book, and which he has stigmatized as "blue, i. e., bloody laws." Mr. Trumbull begins with a republication of the "Connecticut Constitution of 1638–39;" or "the fundamental orders by which the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield became associated and conjoined to be as one Public State or Commonwealth—not a confederacy of petty sovereignties, but a union under a government of the people's choice, exercising the supreme power of

the Commonwealth, and maintaining liberty under law." As Mr. Trumbull says: "This constitution has been justly characterized as the first properly American Constitution—a work in which the framers were permitted to give body and shape for the first time to the genuine republican idea that dwelt as an actuating force or inmost sense in all the New England colonies." That the spirit which actuated these people may be better understood, Mr. Trumbull adds a sketch of the sermon which the Rev. Thomas Hooker preached before the General Court in May, 1638, when the Constitution was framed. He adds, also, an extract from his letter to Gov. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, giving his views respecting the nature of civil government, and stating his conviction that "a general council chosen by all to transact businesses which concern all is most safe for the relief of the whole." Then follow the twelve capital laws established in 1642. After this is placed the first Connecticut Code, which was compiled by Roger Ludlow; then such laws and orders of the Connecticut courts (1636–1662) as were repealed before the adoption of the code of 1650, and such as were made between 1650 and the re-establishment under the charter in 1662, together with a few judgments rendered and sentences pronounced by the General and Particular Courts. Next, the "Fundamental Agreement of the Planters of New Haven," which is the constitution of the New Haven Colony, and which was adopted by the free planters June 14, 1639, and which continued in force until the union of the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut in 1665. Then appears the New Haven code of laws of 1655; to which are added specimens of the judgments of the New Haven General Court before 1655. Mr. Trumbull then gives in full the "Blue Law Forgeries of Peters," and finally selections from the contemporary laws and judicial proceedings of other colonies, namely: New York, Virginia, Maryland, and Massachusetts, together with some of the laws of England in the reign of James I.

No better method could be adopted to show the baselessness of the popular idea that the legislation of Connecticut and New Haven was characterized by any special severity, or that there was in it any thing absurd or ridiculous. It is thus made to stand out amid the legislation of the times as eminently wise

and dignified. It hardly need be said that such has been the opinion of all unprejudiced historical students. Mr. Bancroft says: "There is no State in the Union, and I know not any in the world, in whose early history, if I were a citizen, I could find more of which to be proud, and less that I should wish to blot." Dr. Horace Bushnell says: "Its early history is the most beautiful that was ever permitted to any State or people in the world."

In a valuable "Introduction" of forty-two pages Mr. Trumbull reminds his readers that in determining what kind of men the fathers of New Haven and Connecticut were, their legislation must be compared, not with ours at the present time, but with the contemporary legislation of the other colonies and of the parent country. Estimated in this way, it at once appears what advance was made in the legislation of New Haven and Connecticut, and it is shown that much of the severe and ridiculous legislation which has been falsely charged on New Haven and Connecticut was actually true of New York and Virginia, and other colonies to the south and west.

The author of the second book whose title we have placed at the head of this paper is a descendant of the Rev. Thomas Peters, and professes to give a republication of the "History of Connecticut" from the original copy which belonged to his ancestor, as it left his hands. He says, however, that he has "used notes and quotations from writers and authors of high repute, and from documents and manuscripts written before the Revolutionary War." Now, such a republication would, doubtless, have a value. The original edition has been long a rare book, as is even the American reprint of 1829. But—would it be believed?—Mr. McCormick has actually interwoven his new matter with the old in such a way that it is impossible to tell which is the work of Mr. Peters and which of Mr. McCormick! Occasionally there is a note marked as editorial, which would naturally lead the reader to suppose that the other notes, which are not thus accredited, are a part of the original publication of his ancestor. This is not all. Mr. McCormick has even taken liberties with the text, and seems to have suppressed at will important passages. Then, too, his failure to correct some amusing and glaring typographical errors in the original, together with certain other errors as glaring into

which he falls himself, reveal his own ignorance and his utter incompetence for the work he has attempted. The republication, in its way, makes a very suitable companion volume for the original "History." Both are worthless, except for the book collector.

## ART. V.—WAS WESLEY ORDAINED A BISHOP BY ERASMUS?

A LETTER written in the beginning of this century by a clergyman of the Episcopal Church to a brother clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church has called forth this present article. Its preparation is due to the belief that a free, full, and impartial investigation of the alleged ordination of Wesley by the Greek bishop, Erasmus, to the episcopacy, is not to be found in the range of Methodist literature. Why it has been almost banished from the writings of our excellent historians and casuists in Church polity I will not presume to show, being persuaded that their works will bear the test of severest criticism as to candor, prudence, and honor. It may be that the letter, soon to be given, will supply the reason for silence at a time when to speak would have been unwise. Whatever reasons may heretofore have had a constraining influence, nothing now restrains a laudable endeavor to "set up the ancient landmarks" by which the line of Methodist ordinations may be traced to its source.

I propose to carry the subject through the following categories: 1. What proof have we of Mr. Wesley's consecration by Erasmus? 2. What may be found to disprove such a statement? 3. Would the admission of the Erasmian consecration be the best interpretation of Mr. Wesley's ecclesiastical actions?

1. Was Mr. John Wesley ordained bishop by Erasmus?

In addition to the current literature, the following letter will be read with unaffected interest:—

CORLEAR'S HOOK, NEW YORK, *May* 11, 1809.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: I was highly entertained yesterday at the Conference in John-street, at which presided the Right Rev. Francis Asbury, Bishop over the Methodist Churches in America, whose episcopal authority has been spoken against by some of the

Episcopalians claiming authority under the Latin Church, who boldly deny the validity of Methodist episcopacy, and found their assertions on a point by no means certain—that the Rev. John Wesley was never more than a presbyter in the Church of England, and, of course, could not consecrate Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and others, to a higher order than a presbyter.

I took it for granted that the said denial was made with a view to expose the Methodist Bishops to the severity of the *Præmunire* Act of Henry VIII., if the Methodists should prove that the Rev. John Wesley was consecrated a Bishop in the Christian Church by Erasmus, a Greek Bishop, and now Bishop and successor of Titus, first Bishop of Crete. But if the Methodists do not come forward and prove Mr. Wesley to be a Bishop according to the Greek Church, then the enemy will say the Methodist episcopacy is but a Latin presbytery.

Seeing a book entitled, "An Enquiry into the Validity of Methodist Episcopacy," and considering its artful tendency, I published a vindication of the history of the Rev. Hugh Peters, and added a note which gives the origin of Methodist episcopacy in England. My design was to warn the Methodists to keep out of the reach of the English *Præmunire* Act; and to let their enemies vaunt over their own bold assertions rather than expose to certain misery and death their pious and conscientious bishops, who would sooner run their heads against a burning mountain than usurp episcopacy.

Had I been present when Erasmus consecrated Mr. John Wesley a Bishop in the Christian Church, I would sooner broil on the gridiron with St. Lawrence than divulge it and prove it, so long as the English *Præmunire* Act exists as a pillar to support the hierarchy of the Church of England.

Dr. Seabury I introduced to Mr. John Wesley after the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to consecrate him Bishop of Connecticut, and Mr. Wesley would have consecrated him, and Dr. Seabury was willing to be consecrated by Mr. Wesley; but Mr. Wesley, by the best advice, would not sign the letter of orders to Seabury as Bishop in the Christian Church.

Then Dr. Horn, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Barkley, and others, advised Dr. Seabury to receive his consecration from the Jacobite Bishops in Scotland, who are not State Bishops, but were degraded from being Lord Bishops because they would not take the oath of allegiance to William III. in 1688.

I pretend not to be in the secret of the consecration of Mr. John Wesley by Erasmus, but I am so convinced of the fact that I would as soon be consecrated a Bishop in the Christian Church by Bishop Asbury, or ——, Bishop Coke, or ——, as by Dr. Sutton, Archbishop of Canterbury, or by Dr. Porteus, Lord Bishop of London. And that the *jure divino* of episcopacy from Erasmus came from St. John of Jerusalem Rome and England admit; but Rome admits not the *jure divino* episcopacy in the Church of England.

The question still remains, Was Mr. John Wesley made a

bishop by Erasmus, now Bishop of Crete? The answer is valid —John Wesley would not have acted as bishop if he had not been consecrated by Erasmus, nor would Dr. Coke, nor Mr. Asbury, etc. Thus believed Dr. Horn, Dr. Barkley, Charles Wesley, and hundreds of others who knew them, as well as, Rev. and dear brother, Yours affectionately, SAMUEL A. PETERS.*

I am Bishop elect of Ver(d)mont; should I ever go there or in Connecticut, I would solicit a consecration by a bishop in the line from Erasmus, in order to be free of error supposed to exist in the Latin Church.

The Rev. Mr. COATES, Pearl-street, New York.

Who was Samuel A. Peters? A minister of the Church of England; a man, it is said, "of talents, learning, and extensive erudition." After having "a parochial charge in London for thirty years," he emigrated to these United States, and was Bishop elect of Vermont, mention of which fact may be found in the journals of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, where, also, it is asserted that his consecration was refused on the ground that the Convention of Vermont had not signed the Constitution of the above-mentioned Church. He was personally known to the early Methodist preachers, one of whom has left the following interesting statement of a conversation with him:—

Dr. Peters informed me that when Dr. Seabury was refused consecration by the Bishop in England, the said Bishop told him he was prohibited by the law of the realm from consecrating him, but advised him to apply to Mr. Wesley for consecration. Dr. Seabury replied, "Is Wesley a bishop?" To which the Bishop answered, "We do not undertake to answer that question. It is not for us to determine. But apply to him; he can satisfy you, and consecrate you." Dr. Peters was present at the interview, and went with and introduced Dr. Seabury to Mr. Wesley, who was

* The above letter was written to Rev. Samuel Coate, who was at that time Presiding Elder of Lower Canada District. A copy of it was furnished to Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, among whose controversial MSS. it was found. Mr. Cooper collected a large body of notes, with a view of publishing a book on the origin of Methodist episcopacy. The letter is marked No. VII in the list of papers he had arranged for publication. Mr. Cooper was himself well acquainted with Dr. Peters, and thus speaks of him: "Dr. Samuel A. Peters is an Episcopal minister of the Church of England—of talents, learning, and extensive erudition; was minister in parochial charge thirty years in London. He was Bishop elect for Vermont, (see the Journals of the General Convention, where it is mentioned,) and no reason was offered for refusing his consecration but that the Convention of Vermont had not signed their Constitution." These highly valuable MSS. were kindly put into my hands by Mr. Cooper's nephew, Rev. I. T. Cooper, D.D., of Camden, Del.

so far satisfied that he would have been willingly consecrated by him if Mr. Wesley would have signed his letter of orders as Bishop, which Mr. Wesley could not do without incurring the penalty of the *Præmunire* Act. He would have signed as Superintendent, etc.

Dr. Peters also gave the following: "A clergyman once asked Mr. Wesley, 'Were you consecrated bishop by Erasmus?' Wesley replied, 'Have you read the *Præmunire* Act?' 'Yes.' 'Would you have me answer you truly?' 'Yes, or not at all.' 'Then, under the circumstances, I cannot answer you.'"

The point in the letter with which we are almost exclusively concerned is the consecration of Wesley by Erasmus. If the testimony of credible witnesses to the alleged act of consecration was available the question could be easily solved, but Dr. Peters does not pretend "to be in the secret of Mr. Wesley's consecration," nor have we ever heard of any one who does. It may be that some traveler whose attention is drawn to the subject may discover in the Arcadian archives, among the documents of Erasmus, the necessary information to make the affirmative of the question positive. We commend the search to those who have leisure and inclination to make it.

Again, few will contend—we certainly should deny—that Mr. Wesley has ever stated publicly that he performed any act of an episcopal character by virtue of any authority supposed to be derived from the Erasmian consecration. His enemies called him the Bishop of Moorfields, but he styled himself a presbyter of the Church of England. On the other hand, it must be admitted by all that, though asked, both in public and in private, about the alleged consecration, neither he nor his friends who knew him best have ever denied that he was so consecrated. And if he was, it was an act which he might obviously desire should be kept secret. He knew how great would be the peril to him and his societies on account of the malignity of his enemies; nor could he hope to escape from a persecution far more to be dreaded than that which was visited upon him for the consent he gave to ordinations by Erasmus, about which there has been no dispute. And, finally, though no public announcement of such an act has been made, and no record is traceable in all his writings, yet the allegation will be

materially supported if upon investigation it be found that his acts, subsequently to his asserted ordination, will admit of a more intelligent and fairer explanation on that supposition than any other hypothesis will give them.

Let us now proceed to particulars.

Erasmus, a Bishop in the Greek Church, of the diocese of Arcadia, in Crete, visited London in 1763. During his sojourn in that city he became acquainted with Mr. Wesley and some of his preachers. He was impressed by the magnitude and success of the wonderful revival then in progress, and likewise was aware of the grave embarrassments that pressed upon Mr. Wesley because of the urgent entreaties of the larger societies, especially, to have the sacraments administered to them in their own chapels. He found John Wesley to be almost alone in the grave responsibility of caring for the thousands who had been awakened to a religious life. Of ministerial helpers he had but few. His brother Charles had ceased to itinerate in 1757. There was danger lest the Methodist preachers should undertake to administer the Lord's supper without previous ordination. Some had already done so. Mr. Wesley believed it to be a sin for an unordained minister to celebrate the eucharist; but he was unwilling to violate the established order by himself ordaining any of his preachers. Pressed by these conditions, he applied to the Greek bishop to ordain John Jones, one of his helpers, having first sought and obtained satisfactory evidence of the episcopal character of that prelate. Mr. Jones was ordained, as were also others who were recommended; but the storm of opposition beat so ruthlessly upon his head that, though he had put on the gown, he was soon forced to leave the connection.

In the following year a writer in "Lloyd's Evening Post" boldly asserted that (in addition to the ordinations made by Erasmus, in which number may be included Alexander Mather, subsequently ordained by Mr. Wesley to be his successor over the Methodist societies in England) "two celebrated Methodist preachers made also application to the same Bishop, to consecrate one or both of them bishops; but that the Greek told them it was contrary to the rules of his Church for one bishop to make another; yet, notwithstanding all he said, they very unwillingly took a denial."

Seven years later Rev. Augustus Toplady, among other categories propounded to Mr. Wesley, reiterated the charge above mentioned by the inquiry, "*Did you not strongly press this supposed Greek Bishop to consecrate you a bishop, that you might be invested with a power of ordaining what ministers you pleased to officiate in your societies as clergymen?*" (The italics are ours.) "In all this did you not palpably violate the oath of supremacy which you have repeatedly taken—part of which runs thus: 'I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm?'"

How did Mr. Wesley meet this implied charge? According to one of his biographers, Rev. Richard Watson, "he was falsely reported to have sought consecration."* Another, Tyerman, says:—

> We have the absolute declaration of Wesley himself that Erasmus never rejected any overture that he made to him, and if this were so, it follows that Erasmus did actually ordain him a bishop, or that Toplady's insinuation is calumniously untrue. To this, also, must be added the testimony of Thomas Olivers, who, with Wesley's consent, if not at his request, replied to Toplady's attack, namely, that though Mr. Wesley did get Erasmus to ordain John Jones, and though John Jones did dress as a clergyman of the Church of England, and did assist Mr. Wesley in administering the Lord's Supper in the Methodist societies, yet Wesley had authorized him (Olivers) to give the most positive and unqualified denial to the insinuation that he had asked Erasmus to ordain himself to the high office of a bishop. But [continues Olivers] suppose he had, where would have been the blame? Mr. Wesley is connected with a number of persons who have given every proof which the nature of the thing allows, that they have an inward call to preach the Gospel. Both he and they would be glad if they had an outward call too. But no bishop in England will give it to them. What wonder, then, if he was to endeavor to procure it by any other innocent means?†

Having in these quotations the substance of all that can be positively asserted in denial of the Erasmian consecration of Mr. Wesley, it remains that the denial itself be examined:—

First, It does not deny the fact of the ordination, but that Mr. Wesley had asked the Greek Bishop to ordain him. Why

* "Life of the Rev. John Wesley," American edition, note, p. 251.

† "Life and Times of Wesley," vol. ii, pp. 488, 480.

did not Mr. Wesley authorize Olivers to deny the thing itself, as well as the form of the thing?

Second, It does maintain the importance of connecting the inward call to preach the Gospel with the outward call, which both Mr. Wesley and his apologist, Mr. Olivers, regarded as securable through the ordination of a bishop, whether Anglican or Greek. If Mr. Wesley's episcopalianism went no further than some are disposed to assert, why did he ask Erasmus, as bishop, to ordain Mr. Jones, and why was he so careful to satisfy himself first as to the episcopal character of that prelate? Why should he induce a foreign ecclesiastic, contrary to the spirit of the law of his country, to perform an episcopal act that himself could have done as well if he believed that the outward call could be assured to one as truly by a presbyter as by a bishop?

The conclusion is inevitable, from Mr. Wesley's stand-point in this transaction, that a valid ministry is dependent on episcopal prerogative.

For the sake of perspicuity, an examination of Mr. Wesley's episcopalianism is herewith presented. His logic on the subject may be thus formulated: Every pastor in the Church of God, to be valid, must be constituted by the *inward call* of the Lord Jesus Christ and the *outward call* of the Church, through its episcopal head.

We apprehend that the founder of Methodism has suffered alike from friendly and hostile hands, by reason of a failure of each respectively to regard the broad distinction in Mr. Wesley's mind between the calling and work of a preacher and that of a pastor; yet in this respect his statements are clear, positive, and comprehensive. In 1789 he uttered a sermon on "The Ministerial Office." In it the distinction is purposely made between the office of an evangelist, or preacher, and that of pastor, in these words:

> The great High Priest of our profession sent apostles and evangelists to proclaim glad tidings to all the world; and then pastors, preachers, and teachers to build up in the faith the congregations that should be founded. But I do not find that ever the office of an evangelist was the same with that of a pastor, frequently called a bishop. He presided over the flock and administered the sacraments: the former assisted him, and preached the word either in one or more congregations. I cannot prove from

any part of the New Testament, or from any author of the three first centuries, that the office of an evangelist gave any man a right to act as a pastor or bishop. I believe these offices were considered as quite distinct from each other till the time of Constantine." *

Proceeding to show, by reference to the Presbyterians, to the Church of England, and to the Roman Catholics, that the office of evangelist or teacher did not imply that of a pastor, to whom peculiarly belonged the administration of the sacraments, and that authority to preach was not ordination, he gave an outline of proceedings in the Methodist societies for the half century that was then about closing.

Nothing can be clearer than the following, addressed to his preachers:—

For supposing (what I utterly deny) that the receiving you as a preacher at the same time gave an authority to administer the sacraments, yet it gave you no other authority than to do it, or any thing else, where I appoint. But where did I appoint you to do this? Nowhere at all. Therefore by this very rule you are excluded from doing it. And in doing it you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which was wholly and solely to preach the Gospel.

Again he says:—

I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England; I love her liturgy; I approve her plan of discipline, and only wish it could be put into execution. I do not knowingly vary from any rule of the Church unless in those few instances where I judge, and as far as I judge, there is an absolute necessity.

The points at which he varied are stated, being limited to five: 1.) Preaching abroad; 2.) Praying extempore; 3) Forming classes; 4.) The yearly conference; 5.) Appointing the preachers for the ensuing year.

He knew that men would think him inconsistent with himself, in saying that in varying from the Church of England he did not separate from it, and he said:—

They cannot but think so unless they observe my two principles—the one, that I dare not separate from the Church, that I believe it would be a sin to do so; the other, that I believe it would be a sin not to vary from it in the points above mentioned. . . . (Both of which I have constantly and openly avowed for up-

* Wesley's Sermon cxxxix, vol. ii, Am. Ed. 1851.

ward of fifty years) and inconsistency vanishes away. I have been true to my profession from 1780 to this day.

Observing the distinction thus made, our quest after the true position of Mr. Wesley will be facilitated by placing his teachings on the subject in two parallel columns under the captions.

LAY MINISTRY.

1745. Wesley on the employment of laymen to preach:

"In all Protestant Churches ordination is not held a necessary pre-requisite of preaching; for in Sweden, in Germany, in Holland, and, I believe, in every Reformed Church in Europe, it is not only permitted but required that before any one is ordained he shall publicly preach a year or more *ad probandum facultatem.*"—*Tyerman*, i, 370.

1746. In the Conference of 1746 Mr. Wesley's lay preachers were defined to be "extraordinary messengers, designed of God to provoke others to jealousy." Three points attested their call to preach —grace, gifts, fruits.—*Ibid.* i, 527, 528.

1755. "If we cannot stop a separation without stopping lay preachers, the case is clear; we cannot stop it at all.

"But if we permit them, should we not do more? Should we not appoint them—since the bare permission puts the matter out of our hands, and deprives us of all our influence? But is it lawful for presbyters circumstanced as

ORDINATION.

1745. To Westley Hall:—"We believe it would not be right to administer either baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission so to do from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the apostles.

"We believe that the threefold order of ministers is not only authorized by its apostolical institution, but also by the written word."—*Tyerman*, i, 496.

At the third day's session of the Conference of 1745, points of Church government being debated, the question was asked, "Is episcopal, independent, or presbyterian Church government most agreeable to reason?" The answer given was that each is a development of the other. A preacher preaches and forms an independent congregation; he then forms another and another in the immediate vicinity of the first; this obliges him to appoint *deacons*, who look on the first pastor as their common father; and as these congregations increase, and as their *deacons* grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons or helpers, in respect of whom they are called *presbyters* or elders, as their father in the Lord may be called the *bishop* or overseer of them all."—*Ibid.*, p. 499.

1746. Question at the Conference held this year, "Are the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons plainly described in the New Testament?" Answer: "We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Churches of the apostolic age."—*Tyerman*, i, p. 509.

1748. Wesley alleged that the system of Quakerism differed from Christianity, (3,) "Because it sets aside ordination to the ministry by the laying on of hands."—*Tyerman's Wesley*, ii, p. 30.

we are to appoint other ministers? This is the very point wherein we desire to be advised, being afraid of leaning to our own understanding."—*Wesley's Letter to Rev. Mr. Walker, Meth. Mag.*, 1779, p. 376.

To the Rev. Thomas Adams he wrote from London, Oct. 31, 1755:

"We vary from the rules of the Church, and permit laymen whom we believe God has called to preach.

"I say *permit*, because we ourselves have hitherto viewed it in no other light. This we are clearly satisfied we *may* do; that we may do more we are not satisfied. It is not clear to us that presbyters, so circumstanced as we are, may appoint or ordain others; but it is that we may *direct*, as well as *suffer*, them to do what we conceive they are *moved to by the Holy Ghost*. It is true, that in *ordinary* cases both an inward and an outward call are requisite."

1756. "These preachers are not ministers; none of them undertakes the care of a single flock."

To Mr. Norton:—"You charge me with *self-inconsistency* in tolerating lay preaching and not lay administering." . . . "I tolerate lay preaching because I conceive there is an absolute necessity for it; yet I do not tolerate *lay administering*, because I do not conceive there is any such necessity for it."

1756. Letter of Mr. Wesley to the Rev. Mr. Clark:—

"I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture I do not believe. The plea of *divine right* for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church."

Letter to the Rev. Samuel Walker:—

"What authority have I to forbid their (lay preachers) doing what I believe God has called them to do? I apprehend, indeed, that there ought, if possible, to be both an outward and inward call to this work; yet if one of the two be supposed wanting, I had rather want the outward than the inward call."

To Mr. Norton: — "Some of our preachers who are not ordained think it quite right to administer the Lord's Supper, and believe it would do much good. I think it quite wrong, and believe it would do much hurt. You believe it is a duty to administer; do so, and therein follow your own conscience. I verily believe it is a sin, which, consequently, I dare not *tolerate;* and herein I follow mine."

1761. "In every point of an indifferent nature we obey the Bishops for conscience' sake; but we think *episcopal* authority cannot reverse what is fixed by divine authority."—*Tyerman*, ii, p. 403.

These quotations represent Mr. Wesley's views of episcopacy up to the period when, it is claimed, the Erasmian ordination was performed. There is noticeable in them that remarkable consistency which distinguished the whole course of our venerable founder's life. The only change that time and research and the most patient reflection had produced was that of his former opinion concerning diocesan episcopacy. This opinion he abandoned; but he has nowhere asserted that himself, as a presbyter in the Church of England, was authorized to appoint

or ordain ministers. Hence he did it not, although he was greatly embarrassed in his work and congregations because there were no preachers among the Methodists to assist him in administering the sacraments.

From these facts it is evident that Mr. Wesley, in 1763, was an earnest advocate of episcopal ordination as the medium of transition from the laical to the clerical state. And though, after reading and research, he was convinced that at first presbyters and bishops were of the same order, yet in all this period, amid all the agitations in regard to administering the sacraments by some of his preachers, he was not in a single instance known to have suggested, either to his brother clergymen, or to the most trusted of his preachers, the propriety of presbyterial ordination. On the contrary, he doubted whether presbyters, so situated as he and his coadjutors were, were at liberty to do more than permit and direct lay preachers.

After the most careful inquiry and comparison of his subsequent work with the transactions and management undertaken by him, we are forced to the conclusion that from the close of 1763 to the end of his life Mr. Wesley became more magisterial in the management of his societies, and episcopal in his conduct toward and with his preachers.

The year 1764 is the date of a new departure. And the most reasonable explanation that can be furnished is that with which this essay has to do—that he was vested by the consecration of Erasmus with episcopal authority.

Candor compels us to note these instances of change with some degree of precision. First of all, we find that from henceforth he assumes the sole government of the Methodist societies. His brother Charles not only ceased to be his counselor, but the intercourse between them was well-nigh broken off. He issued a "Pastoral Address," as it was denominated by Tyerman, to the societies in Bristol, over which his brother had had supervision for several years, without alluding either by name or association to his former companion and adviser.

He wrote letters to all the evangelical clergymen in England, with whom he desired to form, according to his own words, afterward uttered, "a league offensive and defensive," on the subject of Christian union, the basis of which, reduced to its simplest terms of expression, was that they should mutually

General Library University of Michigan

agree in teaching the cardinal doctrine of redemption, defend each other's characters when assailed, and permit him and his societies to pursue their course unfettered, though that course might be declared irregular, wholly or in part. Though he had constantly held that the Methodist societies were a part of the Church of England, yet when clergymen, acknowledged by him to be evangelical, and true spiritual leaders, proposed that Mr. Wesley should give up the sole management of the societies within their respective parishes to the duly accredited parish minister, he refused to withdraw his preachers, or to turn over the members gathered by them to the settled minister.

He asserted now for the first time that "all the Methodists throughout Great Britain and Ireland were one body." And in making this assertion there could be but the implied fact that that one body was under one head. As head of that body he "opened chapels in the sense of consecrating them," (a prerogative of the Bishop in the Church of England,) and asserted that "no other consecration of church or chapel is allowed, much less required in England, than the performance of public worship therein." He sought to cement the bond of union in his societies by the raising of a common fund, connectional in character, with which to pay the chapel debts; and in 1784, previous to his personal acts of ordination, made provision by which the Methodists, both as a conference and in their Church property, should have a legal standing in the kingdom.

In 1765 a person was sent through England to examine chapel deeds, and to appoint trustees where needed. To the Rev. Mr. Venn, the Vicar of Huddersfield, into whose ecclesiastical preserves some of Mr. Wesley's preachers had ventured, in violation of a formal compact agreed upon by them, Mr. Wesley wrote, June 22, 1765: "I want no man living, I mean none but those who are connected with me, and who bless God for that connection. With these I am able to go through every part of the work to which I am called." He intimates that the distance between himself and the reverend vicar had been increased by some who accused him of love of power, and said in reply, "The power I have never sought. It was the undesired, unexpected result of the work. . . . I am not satisfied with 'Be very civil to the Methodists, but have nothing to do with

them.' No. I desire to have a league, offensive and defensive, with every soldier of Christ." *

During the following year he sought to break down the estrangement that had grown up between him and his brother Charles, but he does not scruple in the least to style himself the head of the work. "If," says he, "I am in some sense the head, and you the heart," etc. He urges his brother's attendance upon the Leeds Conference, where the most thorough discussion of his own administrative power was had which had yet taken place. To the consideration of that point especially attention is now directed.

In answer to the question, "What power is this which you exercise over all the Methodists in Great Britain and Ireland?" he first recounts the history of the origin of the power of admitting into and excluding from the societies under his care, of choosing and removing stewards, of receiving and not receiving helpers, of appointing them when, where, and how to help him, and of selecting out of their number any whom he might desire to meet him when he deemed it good.

If men regarded it as too much power for one man to exercise, he told them he did not seek it; it came upon him unawares. He was never fond of it, but he bore it as a burden which God had laid upon him; that, in substance, if either preachers or members desired to leave him they were free to do so; "but he who stays" must do so on the same terms that existed when he joined him first.

He admitted that he exercised this power singly, without any colleagues therein.

It cannot escape observation that this complaint of Mr. Wesley's exercise of power was a new thing in the history of the Methodist societies. Hampson and others regarded it as more manifestly despotic during the last ten or fifteen years of his supremacy than before. We here have Mr. Wesley's explanation—a thing out of harmony with his life and work had there been no need for explanation.

The Conference of 1766 is further memorable as the date of the beginning of that more perfect form of keeping up a vitalized membership through systematic pastoral work. The great organizer, intent on the mighty purpose of his soul to build up

* Methodist Magazine, 1782, p. 495.

a great Church of godly members, took upon himself the development of the plan that would as certainly demand pastors for its execution as the former had demanded preachers. The Rules for Pastoral Visitation in 1766 have been the basis and substance of the rules of the Church down to the present time. Here, too, begin the series of questions proposed to every preacher on probation, before his being received into full connection, which, with unimportant omissions, are now propounded to every candidate before his admission to ordination.

In 1768 the point was raised in the yearly conference as to whether the itinerant preachers should be allowed to engage in trade. They were meagerly supported, and were without any clerical status whatever; but Mr. Wesley now regarded them as practically occupying, though not in orders, "the same position as ministers in the Church of England, and hence he considered it as unseemly and as improper for his itinerants to engage in trade as it would be for the clergy of the Established Church." They who had engaged thus were accordingly advised to give up their business.

In 1769, having at Conference referred again to the disinclination of the evangelical clergymen of the Church of England toward the Methodist movement, Mr. Wesley invited his preachers to consider upon the propriety of arranging to continue the work as a united society in the event of his death, by the selection of a proper stationing power. He set forth his own plan, and, at the request of the preachers, published the "Minutes," in which that plan was embodied, the following year. Nothing, however, seems to have come of it, and the matter gave no further concern, apparently, to Mr. Wesley until the year 1773, when he addressed a very remarkable letter to Mr. Fletcher of Madeley, the contents of which it is necessary to study most carefully.

Mr. Wesley was now seventy years of age, his health was seriously affected, and he began most earnestly to "set his house in order." He felt the importance of securing a successor for the societies under his charge. Hence the letter, from which we extract the following:—

DEAR SIR: What an amazing work has God wrought in these kingdoms in less than forty years! And it not only continues, but

increases throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland; nay, it has lately spread into New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina. But the wise men of the world say, "When Mr. Wesley drops, then all is at an end!" And so surely it will unless before God calls him hence one is found to stand in his place. For Ουκ αγᾶθὸν πολυκοιρανία. Εἷς κοιρανός εστῶ, (A government of many is not good. Let there be one governor.) I see more and more, unless there be one προεστώς (bishop, president, or superintendent) the work can never be carried on. The body of the preachers are not united, nor will any part of them submit to the rest, so that either there must be one to preside over all, or the work will indeed come to an end.

After mentioning the necessary qualifications for such a person, he insists that God has provided such a one.

Who is he? *Thou art the man!* God has given you a measure of loving faith, and a single eye to his glory. He has given you some knowledge of men and things, particularly of the whole plan of Methodism. . . . Come out, then, in the name of God! Come to the help of the Lord against the mighty! Come while I am alive and capable of labor! Come while I am able, God assisting, to build you up in faith, to ripen your gifts, and to introduce you to the people.*

To this significant letter Fletcher replied, promising that should God call Mr. Wesley first, he would do his best, by the Lord's assistance, to help his brother Charles "to gather the wreck, and keep together those who are not absolutely bent upon throwing away the Methodist doctrine and discipline." He further stated that he had some convictions of the propriety of taking the position of Mr. Wesley's deacon: "Not with any view of presiding over the Methodists after you, God knows, but to save you a little in your old age, and be in the way of receiving, perhaps of doing, more good."

This, then, is the conclusion to which Mr. Wesley came, a conclusion somewhat different from that indicated to the Conference four years previously, and a conclusion that leaves the later plan open to two interpretations, in accordance with the construction of the term expressed in Greek characters.

The most natural conclusion is that προεστώς was used by Mr. Wesley in the ecclesiastical sense. According to Justin Martyr the term was synonymous with επίσκοπος, αρχίερευς, ἱεράρχης.† So in the ancient Church the president of the brethren

* Tyerman, from Whitehead's Life of Wesley, vol. ii, p. 335.

† Apolog., ii, p. 67.

was considered to be the bishop. The less probable construction is that Mr. Wesley simply intended to use the term to indicate a presiding officer. Of the latter we have doubt, because of the character of the reply of Mr. Fletcher, who was in orders as well as Mr. Wesley, but who speaks of bearing the relation of deacon to Mr. Wesley, which he could not, except in the sense of a ministerial attendant on him as bishop. This was, also, in accordance with ancient Church usage, which was to regard them as adjutants of the bishops. "Let the deacon refer all these things to the bishop, as Christ did to the Father." "Such things as he is able, let him rectify by the power which he has from the bishop, just as the Lord is delegated by the Father to act and to decide; but let the bishop judge the more important cases." *

It remains to be added that both Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher were too sincere to use terms in any other sense than that appropriated to them, without explanatory clauses to fix their meaning. Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher alike, therefore, regarded our founder as a bishop, and both considered Mr. Wesley's proposition to be that of making Mr. Fletcher Bishop of the Methodists after Mr. Wesley's death. It is evident that Mr. Wesley was loth to give up the plan suggested to Mr. Fletcher, and in 1776 the latter found it necessary to utter another refusal in a letter to the former, from which we take the following:—

MADELEY, *Jan.* 9, 1776.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: . . . I could, if you wanted a traveling assistant, accompany you, as my little strength would admit, in some of your excursions; but your recommending me to the societies as one that might succeed you (should the Lord call you hence before me) is a step to which I could by no means consent. . . . It would make people suspect that what I have done for truth and conscience' sake I have done with a view of being what Mr. Toplady calls "the Bishop of Moorfields." † J. FLETCHER.

During the two following years the controversialists against Mr. Wesley frequently reiterated the charge that he had been long desirous of being made bishop.

Our investigation now introduces us to the events that, by both time and circumstance, closely connect our matter with

* Apostol. Constitutions, lib. ii, c. 44, 30.

† Tyerman's Life and Times of Wesley, iii, p. 212.

the ordinations performed by Mr. Wesley. Thus far we have not been able to find a single expression or intimation of his change of opinion in regard to episcopal ordination. The records of the next five years ought, therefore, to have a very careful study. What will they prove?

We shall find, in 1779, a lay preacher of talent, influence, and popularity, summarily dismissed from the connection by the sole act of Mr. Wesley because he resisted the latter's appointment of a certain deposed clergyman to the society in Bath, to which himself had been assigned at the previous Conference. Of Rev. Mr. Smyth, the clergyman referred to above, much could be said in praise of his Christian zeal and high ministerial qualifications, but Mr. M'Nab was his peer in every respect save in that of being found wanting in clerical orders. The setting aside of the lay preacher was peculiarly gratifying to Rev. Charles Wesley, whose spirit had for years been troubled on account of the growing popularity of the preachers, and the probability that after his brother's death they would break the societies off from the Establishment. We shall find Mr. Wesley in the following year receiving back into his ranks and his personal confidence the above preacher, "without an acknowledgment of his fault," much to the dissatisfaction of his brother. But, more especially, we shall find Mr. Wesley himself declaring his conviction on the validity of presbyterial ordination.

We turn, then, with interest to the transactions of the year 1780. Grave difficulties had fallen across the path of the Wesleyan itinerants in America. To meet a want which it seemed could not be provided for in any other way, the most serious innovations had been introduced into some of the American societies. Lay preachers had administered the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the conclusion was now to be reached that should determine whether the nine thousand Methodists in America should be deprived of the sacred ordinances of the Church, or ordained clergymen of the Church of England should be sent to them, or unordained preachers should be appointed to perform those offices, or lay preachers should be ordained by Mr. Wesley for the work. Appeal was made to the great Methodist προεστώς in England. It brought him to a declaration which has hitherto been, and is now, re-

garded by many as the corner-stone of Methodist ecclesiasticism. In a letter to his brother Charles, of June 8, 1780, he writes:—

Read Bishop Stillingfleet's "Irenicum," or any impartial history of the ancient Church, and I believe you will think as I do. I verily believe I have as good a right to ordain as to administer the Lord's Supper. But I see abundance of reason why I should not use that right, unless I was turned out of the Church. At present we are just in our place."*

What was thought of this by his brother may be gathered from the following:—

I am not sure they will not prevail on you to ordain them. You claim the *power*, and only say, "It is not probable you shall ever exercise it." Probability on one side implies probability on the other, and I want better security. So I am to stand by and see the ruin of our cause!

How are we to understand the letter of the 8th of June in comparison with the following, extracted from his letter to Bishop Lowth under the date of August 10 of the same year?

Some time since I recommended to your lordship a plain man, whom I had known above twenty years, as a person of deep, genuine piety and unblamable conversation. But he neither understood Greek nor Latin; and he affirmed in so many words that "he believed it was his duty to preach, whether he was ordained or no." I believe so, too. What became of him since I know not, but I suppose he received *presbyterian ordination;* and I cannot blame him if he did. He might think any ordination better than none.

The interpretation we put upon the subject, as above presented, is that Mr. Wesley based his claim to the right to ordain, not on the ground of his being a presbyter in the Church of England, but on the higher ground of episcopal prerogative. He was not an advocate of a "presidency of order," to use the language of Bishop Stillingfleet. In the Church of England he simply regarded himself as presbyter John, with no right to ordain, in and for that Church, either the preachers under him or other candidates for holy orders. He held himself to be a bishop, (though he uses not the term officially,) because on him rested the sole management of the preachers and societies which had sprung up by virtue of his immense

* Tyerman, iii, p. 332.

activities and labors. As it was the prerogative of the bishop in the ancient Church to administer the Lord's Supper, and neither presbyters or deacons had a right to do so except by the authority of the bishop, so from the ancient Church standpoint he had, also, the co-ordinate right to ordain. He knew that presbyterian ordination would not avail for his societies while they remained members of the Church of England, and they that secured it, if any did so, left his connection.

We have almost come to the end of our investigation, without being able to find one single fact or utterance favorable to an advocacy of presbyterial ordination by Mr. Wesley. Though admission to holy orders was not declared to be invalid if performed by a presbyter, yet it is most apparent that he both preferred and advocated such admission through the hands of a duly constituted bishop. Such is the situation as we approach to the *crux ecclesiasticorum*, the ordinations performed by Mr. Wesley himself. Without giving in detail the text of the history of the ordinations of Messrs. Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey for America, of others for Scotland, and finally of others for England, we must content ourselves with the recital of the facts and their significance.

We have seen that in 1780 Mr. Wesley asserted his belief that he had the right to ordain. In 1784 for the first time he exercised that asserted right. In its exercise he pursued wholly the episcopal plan, beginning with the lowest order, the diaconate, advancing the candidate to be presbyter, and advancing the presbyter to the office of superintendent or bishop. The form of ordination, as set forth in the liturgy of the Church of England, was scrupulously observed in every stage of the proceeding, the only difference being the substitution of the terms "elder" for "presbyter," and "superintendent" for "bishop." There was no difference whatever in the powers defined as pertaining to the three classes. In the American case, there being no Bishops of the Church of England, and but few parish priests in the whole country, "so that for some hundreds of miles together there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper," he conceived that, "violating no order and invading no man's rights," he was at full liberty to appoint and send laborers into the harvest.

Two theories of these ordinations are possible: first, that,

it having been clearly proved to Mr. Wesley that in the primitive Church bishops and presbyters were the same order, he, as presbyter, exercised the same functions which pertain to the episcopate, because episcopal consecration was not essential to the validity of ecclesiastical ordination; second, that his ordinations were episcopal acts, designed and executed on the ground that he was more than a presbyter, being a bishop, "as much so as any man in England."

The maintenance of the first theory requires that it be proved that a presbyter of the Church of England in the eighteenth century was the same as a presbyter in the primitive Church. If, in the Anglican as in the primitive Church, the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" were synonymous, there is ground for belief, unless it is stated otherwise, that Mr. Wesley, being a presbyter in the former, was, by virtue of that position, "bishop," they being "of one order." But if, as all the facts show, the Anglican Church did not, and never did, regard these as "one and the same order," then Mr. Wesley's presbyterial ordination did not vest in him powers episcopal. The Anglican Church never gave to her priests authority to ordain; but all the authority they had came from that Church; therefore it is plain that an English priest could not claim authority to lay on hands or ordain to the ministry. If he did not claim to be a bishop in and of the Church of England, because of the parity of orders, he could in no sense be more than presbyter of that Church; and in and with that Church alone all his ecclesiastical authority existed.

By what secret channel did Mr. Wesley receive that power which has been denied to presbyters for forty-two generations? Whence came his authority to ordain, if he were not, as elder in the Church of England, the same character as was the primitive and apostolic elder? Would it not be quite as arduous an undertaking to prove a succession of elders from the apostles, as of bishops? Yet, if his authority came not by presbyterial succession from the apostles, on what ground could he believe himself to be vested with primitive presbyterial functions? Unlike the primitive elders, all his ecclesiastical endowments were derived and received from diocesan bishops; unlike them, he exercised jurisdiction over a parish that was bounded by neither country, national, or geograph-

ical lines—his "ecclesiastical preserves" spanned kingdoms, stepped over oceans, and were bounded only by the world's horizon; unlike the primitive elder, who came to his place by the voice of his brethren, or the parochial bishop, who held his cure through the assent of the whole body of his compeers, he assumed jurisdiction without, and regardless of, the authority of his Church and the selection of his co-presbyters; and, finally, unlike the presbyter of the primitive Church, he astonished the "Methodist connection" by himself selecting and proposing to ordain "deacon," "elder," and "superintendent," men who were to found a Church on the crumbling ruins of the ecclesiastical system to which he was attached during his whole lifetime. His act may have been apostolical, it was not presbyterial, whether primitive or Anglican.

The second theory, that Mr. Wesley's ordinations were episcopal acts, designed and executed on the ground that he was more than a presbyter, being a bishop, "as much so as any man in England," is that alone by which his ordinations can be made to appear consistent, churchly, and intelligent. Indeed, without it, these essential elements and he part company. To separate them is to perpetrate a species of moral treason of which the present writer feels himself incapable. Let him bear his burden who would brand the grandest character of the eighteenth century with epithets such as were denied by the uniform purposes of his whole life.

In his letter to his brother Charles he defended his acts of ordination in the following words:—

> Obedience I always paid to the Bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land. But I cannot see that I am under any obligation to obey them further than those laws require. It is in obedience to these laws that I have never exercised in England the power, which, I believe, God has given me. I firmly believe I am a scriptural *επίσκοπος*, as much as any man in England or in Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove. But this does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England, from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago.

In reference to the Bishops he says, in the same letter:—

> I do, indeed, vary from them in some points of doctrine, and in some points of discipline (by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming societies,) but not a

hair's breadth further than I believe to be meet, right, and my bounden duty.

Charles Wesley, in reply, said on the points of varying, "Might you not add, and by ordaining?" Wesley did not add, "and by ordaining," because he did not believe he varied from the Bishops in doing this. Why did he not? Because he believed himself not a presbyter of the Church of England only, but Bishop of the Methodist Societies.

How was he constituted bishop? He was not consecrated by any Bishop in the Church of England, nor is there either assertion or evidence that he was chosen by the presbyters friendly to him, and ordained through their instrumentality. The preachers under him did not so choose him, nor did they have the thought that he would ordain any to the ministry. The proposition to ordain came not from them, but from Mr. Wesley himself. If he received not the authority from English Bishops, nor by the election of his co-presbyters, nor by the voice of the people under him, whence did he derive the power? How did he obtain that *outward call* without which he would neither consent for Dr. John Jones to administer the ordinances, nor countenance the same thing in the American preachers? He asserted no right to which he was not truly entitled, nor did he perform a churchly act without due qualification for it. If he was ordained Bishop by Erasmus, Bishop of Arcadia, the matter is at once clear, and his acts present no feature of embarrassment. If not thus qualified, his extraordinary acts can only be supported by the argument of an extraordinary, independent, and special call of God to him to found a new Church, under a new ecclesiastical dispensation. Then would his investiture be divine, higher than either presbyterial or episcopal prerogative, and based on neither. His providential call would not have been because he was presbyter; the Methodist Episcopal Church would have been "a new thing under the sun," the creation of Wesley himself, who must have been regarded as the seminal head, called, constituted, and divinely endowed for that purpose. The departure of the Methodist societies from the bosom and service of the Church of England would have been an exode from old ecclesiastical bondage, and the Bristol private residence where Dr. Coke received his ordination and authority, the Mount Sinai

of Methodism, where the laws, liturgy, ordinances, and regulations of the departing bondsmen were delivered and accepted. I confess that this assumption would be far more consistent than that of basing Mr. Wesley's authority for his ordinations on the ground of his being a presbyter in the Church of England. It would not be, it is true, according to the views of one of his preachers, expressed after the great event had taken place, either "episcopal or presbyterian," but it could not then be declared "a hodge-podge of inconsistencies." * It would have been a divine unfolding of God's method, in the eighteenth century, for the delivery of his spiritual Israel, and of speaking by the great Head of the Church to the nations to put on their breast-plates "Holiness to the Lord."

To sum up the result of our investigation, we have found by the letter of Dr. Peters that the allegation "that Mr. Wesley was ordained bishop by Erasmus" was not made public, though he was sure of the correctness of the charge, because of the peril which would have come to Mr. Wesley through the operation of the *Præmunire* Act. We have found the statement, further, that Dr. Seabury, of Connecticut, was so far satisfied in regard to Mr. Wesley's right to ordain to the episcopate that he was willing to be consecrated by him, and Wesley was willing to consecrate him, but not to sign his letter of order as bishop. We have found Mr. Wesley maintaining a uniform and consistent faith in reference to the order of bishop, and the prerogative of the office; that none not episcopally ordained were admitted by him to administer the sacraments in his societies, though he did not believe that all not so ordained were without authority in their own ecclesiastical organizations; that to secure the services of preachers, to assist in administering the sacraments, he only applied to Bishops of whose episcopal character he had no doubt. We have found that after the asserted Erasmian consecration there has never been a denial of the fact, but, according to Dr. Peters' statement, a strongly implied admission, that Mr. Wesley's acts from 1763 to the close of his life became more episcopal, and had their culmination in the ordination of 1784, and the following years; that he did not claim that he had the power to ordain previous to 1763, though he had read Lord King's work on the primi-

* Whitehead's Life of Wesley, vol. ii, p. 419.

tive Church, nearly twenty years before, and Stillingfleet's Irenicum soon after its publication. We have found that immediately after 1763 he promulged the idea of the unity of all the Methodist societies, in England, Scotland, Ireland, and subsequently in America; that he assumed the sole government of them, checking the aspirations of the preachers, and standing aloof from the counsel of his brother Charles; that he began immediately, too, to discipline his preachers in pastoral work, making their only deficiency, for several years, to be a want of holy orders. We have found him assuming a title of office known in the primitive Church to be applied only to a bishop, and inviting Mr. Fletcher to become his successor therein. We have, finally, found him ordaining to the offices of "deacon," "elder," and "superintendent," and recognizing the three separate orders as valid, true, scriptural, and proper, by virtue of authority not derived from the Church of England, which he felt himself to be "providentially" called upon to exercise.

Had it been formally announced in the Conference of 1764 that in December, 1763, Erasmus of Crete had ordained John Wesley Bishop of the Methodist Societies in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and had he then assumed publicly the title, his subsequent course in the management of his societies would have varied but little, if at all.

## Art. VI.—BISHOP BAKER.

We first saw Baker in the spring of 1828. He had come down from one of the good old towns of New Hampshire, to commence, at Wilbraham, a course of liberal education. He seemed a retiring and amiable youth, of soft speech and gentle ways—not specially social and communicative, save to a select few, to whom, however, he was not backward to converse of his youthful sentiments, trials, and sorrows. His health was not firm and perfect, and a secret infirmity attached itself to him in those days, and which, in fact, was chronic, adhering to him through life, and very possibly contributing to his early decline. Few, doubtless, suspected any such disability, as they have looked upon the apparently robust form and the counte-

nance, so bland and fresh, of his mature manhood. But there were those who saw beneath the outward and the visible, and who knew that this seemingly strong man was, after all, but delicately constituted—that he was ill-adapted to protracted and stern endurance; and who were not surprised that the far reaching travels, the arduous conference sessions, the countless, intricate questions to be officially settled, and the weary labors and exertions generally incidental to the Methodist episcopacy, should prove a burden too heavy and severe to be long sustained by one physically and mentally organized as was Bishop Baker.

At the academy he was diligently and successfully prosecuting his preparatory studies when there came suddenly down upon that company of young men and maidens a remarkable baptism of the Holy Spirit. Of the antecedents of this revival we retain, unfortunately, no very distinct remembrance. Certain devout and excellent young men were there, such as John W. Merrill, Jefferson Haskall, Mosely Dwight, Otis Wilder, Joel Knight, Horace Moulton, Graves, Stocking, and others—all of whom were looking toward the ministry, and whose bearing and example before their fellow-students were without reproach. It was a goodly company for young Baker—not yet a Christian youth—to meet, as he came thither for study; and it was salutary for him to note their wholesome example, and listen to their prayers and to their affecting and earnest addresses and exhortations to flee from the wrath to come and lay hold on eternal life. And when the sacred influences fell, as the dew of heaven, upon that youthful crowd, Baker was not among the last to yield and be saved. Then it was that he and his life-long friend, David Patten, side by side, together bowed to the ever-glorious Redeemer, and, arm in arm, started on their Christian career. Clear and brilliant was his conversion. It had the seeming of a sudden uprising from darkness to light—from tears to smiles—from depression and distress to joy unspeakable. And we remember how that subsequently along that beautiful spring he walked in "newness of life"—how he delighted in the ways of the Lord, and with a glad heart and luminous countenance and sprightly step he participated in the little missionary excursions to the mountain neighborhoods, or along the pleasant plains stretching away

from the academy toward the setting sun. "He's a real soldier," whispered one, as, on one of these excursions, Baker, with quick and gladsome step, was walking in advance of us. He drank, amid those happy days, of the joys of salvation, and seemed, at times, in haste to tell the story all abroad.

Happy for this young man, as well as for many others, that at this special period of his life, and for several years afterward, he was providentially thrown amid the sacred influences emanating from that model Christian gentleman and bright ornament of humanity, Wilbur Fisk. At the academy, and afterward at the university, this great and good man was the presiding genius, toward whom Baker looked with a careful eye and with an admiration and veneration that never diminished and never grew weary. Fisk knew him, watched him, and loved him; and would, at times, steal in unawares when, in one or another suburb of Middletown, Baker was addressing some little assembly, and would there listen to his virgin efforts at preaching.

Summer came, and with it came the close of that memorable term at Wilbraham. Henceforth, for a series of years, Osmon C. Baker and the writer of this sketch were separated—the one prosecuting study at the Middletown University, the other, at Bowdoin College. We subsequently joined hands again at Newbury, Vt., for organizing and conducting the new seminary just established there. Baker, though still a youth, had come up to the stature and aspect of a portly and handsome man—his general appearance being much as it was along his subsequent and maturer years. He stood at six feet, his face full and florid, his eyes protected by spectacles, his hair black, his bearing gentle and sober, and characterized by a calm dignity joined with a pleasant and unaffected urbanity. His was then, and always, a genial and attractive presence, and a stranger who might chance to meet him and look up into his calm and quiet face would be likely to look again, or, perchance, inquire who he might be. More than one who had seen the late excellent Professor Upham, of Bowdoin College, remarked the general resemblance between him and Baker. Nor was the likeness of the two men merely physical. They were similar in many of their modest and retiring ways, in their deeply respectful bearing toward those with whom they

were called to associate, in their indifference to the fashions and attractions of the world, in that profound humility wherein was their daily and hourly walk, in the careful watch constantly maintained at "the door of their lips"—so that few were the unadvised or foolish words they ever uttered, and few the disparaging remarks they ever indulged touching a neighbor or an enemy.

As Baker came to Newbury there stood at his side the one who had given herself to be his life-companion and the sharer of his prosperity and adversity, of his sorrows and his honors. Of this lady, who still survives, it might seem ungraceful to say much; but so much we feel bound to write, namely, that years of observation and pleasant acquaintance could not fail to impress us that had O. C. Baker sought the world over for one very exactly adapted to his taste, or wants, or the varied circumstances attendant upon his life, he could not have succeeded better than in the choice of a wife which he actually made.

And so the new seminary was launched, classes formed, and labors assigned. With commendable energy and courage, and with characteristic prudence and wisdom, did Baker address himself to the arduous labors that awaited him. He was, from the beginning, a competent, popular, and successful teacher and lecturer. Whatever might be the branch of study that devolved upon him to teach, he spared no pains to qualify himself for his task. His previous or general acquaintance with the study could not satisfy him. He was fain to reach out and gather facts and illustrations, sparing no pains that he might be able to present to his pupils the fullest knowledge possible of the subject in hand. That thorough conscientiousness which marked his whole life seemed specially prominent with him as a teacher of youth. In his mind and heart there lived a keen sense of *duty* which he owed to his classes. Instruction was not with him a mere routine to be begun and ended. He would do his whole part toward forming as well as informing the minds of the youth before him, and in shaping and qualifying them for the realization of a happy and noble future. And, cherishing such views as these, not only did he lay himself out for a faithful and complete performance of his work, but he loved that work with the love of an enthu-

siast, while he prosecuted it with the pure and elevated motives of a Christian. His appropriate business was his delight, and it was with difficulty that he could be diverted from what he contemplated as his high calling. Though entirely respectable as a preacher, and as such always acquitting himself well, yet, during those years in which he was occupied as a teacher, whether in the seminary or in the institute, there ever seemed with him a backwardness to entering the pulpit. Hence, with sympathies warm and gentle as those of a woman toward his ministerial brethren, he was, however, wont to shrink from their solicitations to aid in their pulpit labors, and always seemed to evince a decided preference that "the preachers should do their own preaching."

Herein, in fact, might have been seen a prominent characteristic of the man. He craved to be a man of one work, and to one work he sought to dedicate all the talents and energies with which he was endowed, esteeming that therein lay his province and his duty, and that he was incompetent or unable for much that was external to his profession. And this, it seems almost superfluous to add, was one of the grand secrets of his success. This it was that enabled him to stand almost unrivaled as a teacher in any branch of study to which he gave his attention, and in which he undertook to impart instruction. Fruitful of invention, apt and ample in illustration, indefatigable in research, charged with a generous enthusiasm, inspired with a single aim, and prompted to a full and firm endeavor, he came to his classes possessed of conscious strength for his work, and with a complete mastery of the business before him. Strong was he as a teacher, yet, as he taught, there was no affectation of strength—no needless ostentation of ability or learning. True, there were in that lecture-room animation, vivacity, assurance, sunshine; but, withal, the same calmness, the same gentle, affable spirit, that marked him in his general intercourse and habits elsewhere.

Of Baker as a preacher, it is no disparagement to say that he was less distinguished here than as a teacher. It must be remembered that preaching was not his delight, as was teaching; nor were his natural gifts in that direction equal to those that fitted him to shine so conspicuously in the professor's chair. It should be also remembered that most of his public life prior

to his election to the episcopacy was devoted to teaching—a calling which, when long and earnestly pursued, is discerned to induce habits of thought, expression, and manner generally not precisely favorable to that special style of preaching most agreeable to the popular taste. The truly eloquent and popular preacher is ordinarily one with whom preaching is a familiar and regular exercise, and not a mere occasional or incidental effort. This preacher has preaching for his great calling and work. He preaches often, and loves to preach. He preaches the *word*—the great word of life and salvation—in distinction from a mere intellectual deliverance, whether scientific, philosophical, ethical, or even religious. He communes much and long with the Holy Scriptures, and dwells amid the heavenly baptismal influences, and walks with God, and has the wondrous salvation of the Gospel as his own heart experience from day to day, and loves God with all his heart, and loves his race with a love which many waters cannot quench. Somewhere here lies the secret of truly great and eloquent preaching. The Wesleys, and Whitefield, and Fletcher, all understood and exemplified it, and so have a goodly number of their sons in the gospel, dead and living. But, alas! not all are such preachers—we fear, not the majority; not all, even, of those whom the multitude deem the most eloquent and able.

The preaching of Baker might have been justly characterized as sound in sentiment, orderly in arrangement, chaste and correct in style, clear and distinct in statement, pertinent in illustration, convincing in argumentation, and sober and dignified in delivery. As he preached there was discernible very little of chaff among the wheat, very few confused or unmeaning remarks. He was but slightly given to anecdote; he never, in preaching, we believe, awakened a smile, and he seldom extorted a tear. His demeanor in the pulpit was faultless; he was there perfectly himself, assuming no airs, indulging no violent gestures, and evincing no constraint or uneasiness—with attitude firm and dignified, a voice clear and musical, yet, under excitement, often soaring and rapid as he rounded to the close of his sermon. On the whole, he was no mean preacher, but one to whom thoughtful men and women were wont to listen with interest, and often with delight, as the earnest and faithful message issued from his lips. For if Baker

was wanting in one or another of the more showy and popular elements of a great and eloquent preacher, he was far from any lack in what must be reckoned as the basis of all truly excellent preaching. He was well read and sound as a theologian. He had found time for a careful study of Christian doctrine generally, and was specially conversant with all the prominent writers of his own Church, possessing himself of a thorough understanding of their sentiments and spirit; and if, in his labors at the institute, the department of theology had devolved upon him, instead of the one he so ably sustained, his light would have shone there with at least an equal radiance and brilliancy.

Ten years of his early manhood did Baker devote to the labor of instruction at Newbury Seminary, having during the latter half of that term of time the principalship of the institution. They were years of great and severe labors, and it seems needless to add that, in all his relations to the seminary, he acquitted himself honorably and well, and, retiring from the school, he failed not to leave there a name fragrant with a thousand beautiful memories. A few years as pastor and presiding elder succeeded, when Baker received an imperative call to a professorship in the Biblical Institute, then just commencing its eventful career. This enterprise was new in American Methodism, and, as was very natural, was not without opposition even in high places and among the truly excellent of the ministry and membership of the Church. At the same time it had, on the other hand, strong and determined advocates. Such men as Abel Stevens, Charles K. True, James Porter, and others, were among the earliest to take up their pens in its favor. Meanwhile, the great question came presently into discussion in the several New England Conferences, where slowly yet surely the object commended itself to the understandings and hearts of the ministry, and opposition to a similar extent yielded or became silent.

That man of mark, John Dempster, had long cherished in his heart of hearts the idea of a biblical and theological school for the benefit of the Methodist ministry, and was now girding himself for its realization with all that calm yet determined and indomitable energy for which he was so distinguished. Passing from conference to conference, he stood up

in the presence of his brethren, and with his clear, solemn, and stirring eloquence he unfolded, in masterly argument and forceful illustration, the genuine philosophy lying at the foundation of such a school of the prophets as was in contemplation. His efforts were not in vain. The school arose into existence — arose amid strugglings and difficulties, yet under favorable auspices, for Dempster and Baker were its earliest professors and guides.

Here, in this his new professorship, the real ability and strength of Baker shone forth with genuine and unsullied brilliancy. He was no longer a youth, and no novice in the great work of instruction. He was a veteran, rather; had seen long and arduous service in the momentous business of training and instructing youthful minds. Moreover, he had been a faithful student of the various learning adapted to the sacred calling, and had, for several years, been exercising himself in the active ministry. Thus he came to his new work laden with the rich experience and practical knowledge which contributed so largely to fit him for the duties appertaining to his sacred profession. The Homiletical Department of studies and exercises came mainly under his supervision, including a thorough examination of the Methodist polity, spirit, and usages; and in this class of studies few men in the Church were more fully competent to guide, instruct, and counsel candidates for the Methodist ministry. It was in connection with these lectures that his work on the Discipline gradually took shape, and grew into the admirable treatise which he published shortly after entering the episcopacy. This, the only extended literary effort which he saw fit to give to the world, presents a clear and full digest and illustration of what may be termed *Methodist law*, and deservedly received from the press of the Church the highest commendation.

It was not long after entering upon his labors at the institute before, from various quarters, were evident pointings toward Professor Baker as a candidate for the episcopacy. His present position brought him more prominently to the notice of influential ministers in and out of New England, who could hardly fail to discern in him several special qualifications for the high office alluded to. Thus, in connection with this office, his name, with others, began to be frequently agitated in min-

isterial circles; and when the General Conference of 1852 had assembled, at which several bishops would be necessarily elected, Baker's name was soon observed to hold special prominence as the New England candidate. The election occurring, he, with three other candidates, Scott, Simpson, and Ames, were chosen on the first balloting.

It is quite possible, if not entirely certain, that Baker, on taking his seat in that Conference, entertained little or no expectation of such an election. We think he had no aspirations for the office, for he seemed never to aspire to any office, and certainly never sought promotion. He seemed, rather, always to love to walk in lowly paths, and to feel a shrinking from new and heavy responsibilities. He was contented as a simple teacher, and asked for no principalship. He was contented as a pastor, and sought no presiding eldership. And so he was contented as a professor, and sought no bishopric. And, pending his assumption of that highest office in American Methodism, with its attendant responsibilities, it certainly seemed to those who had been long acquainted with his modest pretensions, and his dread of public notice and public station, that the solemn weight of the new duties to which he was now called would prove almost too fearful for endurance. Yet this was a mistake. This new and modest Bishop walked up amid his fresh and untried obligations and labors with a firm and deliberate step. No shrinking or tremor was visible. He seemed to be at once familiar with the new situation, and conscious of ample strength to occupy and honor it. Taking his turn, presently, to preside over that great Conference in which he was quietly sitting, the other day, as one of its members, he had all the seeming of perfect self-possession; and, though the youngest Bishop, we believe, that ever stood before such a Conference, there was apparent an entire familiarity with all the rules governing the presiding officer, and a promptness in their observance, accompanied with a propriety and dignity of bearing and demeanor such as surprised his friends, and confirmed their assurance of his capability for his new position and obligations.

And so did Bishop Baker go forth to grapple with his untried and grave duties as one of the superintendents of the great Methodist Episcopal Church. With what wisdom, en-

ergy, fidelity, diligence, ability, and promptitude, he labored in his new and widely extended field of toil and sacrifice, and with what uniform gentleness, affability, sympathy, and brotherly affection, he bore himself in all his intercourse, official and unofficial, with his brethren, needs not to be detailed here. He, doubtless, knew and felt that he was a Bishop of a great and powerful Church; he shut not his eyes to the sacredness and dignity of his position. At the same time, his characteristic humility, modesty, and simplicity never forsook him. He persisted in remaining a man among men, a brother among brethren, delighting to be reckoned a servant of the disciples, and deeming himself, we doubt not, among the least of them all.

To us, short-sighted mortals, incapable of seeing afar, it seemed a wondrous pity that such a man and such a Bishop should be so early removed from the Church and the world. Painfully pleasant is it to think of Bishop Baker as having been destined, in providence, to tarry long on the earth; to have passed on to a green and vigorous old age—his intellect clear and strong as ever, his form still erect and full, his step still firm and dignified, his old and whitened head still uplifted among his brethren, his beautiful smiles still beaming sunshine around him, his voice still firm in speech and song, and his venerable and noble presence a blessing to see!

But paint not the picture: it was never to be seen or admired. "His sun has gone down while it was yet day;" and it is better to think of him as away, somewhere, in the heavenly Paradise, communing, it may be, with Fisk and other beautiful spirits that ascended aforetime; and mingling with the angels—perchance "a little lower than they;" and, like Daniel, the greatly beloved, "standing in his lot till the end of the days."

"O, though oft depressed and lonely,
All my fears are laid aside,
If I but remember only,
Such as these have lived and died!"

## Art. VII.—PHILO, THE JEW.

No funeral *cortége* was ever seen more splendid than that which conveyed the remains of one of the greatest intellects whose influence the world has ever felt—of the mightiest conqueror of all time. What grander sight than this golden car, drawn by sixty-four mules, each with its golden cover and golden bells, as it moved slowly from Chaldæa across desert and mountain, through the hills and vales of Palestine, to carry its precious deposit to the tomb which gave to the whole quarter of Alexandria where it stood the name of "The Body." That tomb has gradually dwindled away to a wretched Mussulman chapel, kept by an aged crone, who watches over a humble shrine called "The Grave of Iskander." But the whole world was long filled, according to the emphatic saying of Demades, "with the odor of that interment."*

Two years previously (B. C. 331) this master mind, then in the apparent vigor of his manhood, had stood upon the spot whither his remains were now brought for a final resting. He was then on a rapid journey to the oasis of Ammon;† but, as with the eagle's glance, his discerning eye beheld in the little fishing town of Rhacotes the possibility of creating that which hitherto the eastern shores of the Mediterranean had entirely lacked—a magnificent harbor. The low, level reef of the Isle of Pharos furnished the opportunity—when connected with the mainland by a mole—of such a shelter for ships as neither Tyre, nor Sidon, nor Joppa had ever been able to afford. And beyond this magnificent harbor the mighty conqueror perceived the city which should constitute the capital of his vast empire, the point of union of two, or, rather, of three worlds; the place where Europe, Asia, and Africa were to meet and hold communion.

A glance at the map will show what an *ὀμφάλὸς γῆς*—a center of the world—this Alexandria is, and perhaps arouse the suspicion that it has not yet fulfilled its whole destiny, but may become at any time a prize for contending nations, or the center of some world-wide empire to come.‡ Communicating

* Grote, Hist. of Greece, xii, 346. † Sharpe, Hist. of Egypt, i, 220, *et al.*

‡ Readers of history need not to be reminded of the flourishing condition of Alexandria in the early Christian period, and how, until the establishment of the

with Europe and the Levant by the Mediterranean, with India by the Red Sea, it is certain of boundless supplies of food from the desert-guarded valley of the Nile, to which it forms the only key, thus keeping all Egypt, as it were, for its own private farm.*

Though Alexander was not destined to carry out his own magnificent schemes, but was obliged to leave them for execution to his most intimate friend, companion-in-arms, and once even the saviour of his life—the great Ptolemy—posterity failed not to acknowledge their author; and the first Ptolemy himself earned most worthily his distinctions by the zealous manner in which he repaid his royal master and lifelong associate by giving the city the name of its projector. And why should he not have done so? Not Constantine was more identified with the city on the shores of the Bosphorus than was Alexander with that at the mouth of the Nile. His friend Hephestion became its guardian hero. The military cloak of Alexander supplied its outline. It was his own plan for Babylon resuscitated; even the rectangular streets of the Asiatic capital were reproduced.† In the later Jewish phraseology it even bore the name of Babylon.‡

Besides, was it not this self-same Alexander who had made possible the establishment of the world's capital, and in this place? Had he not paved the way by effecting the union of the European and Asiatic races under one empire, leading to the spread of the Greek language as the common vehicle of communication in the Eastern, and, ultimately, in the whole civilized world? It was a striking remark of Hegel§ that Greece, the blooming youth of the world, came in with the youth Achilles and went out with the youth Alexander. But if Grecian history died with Alexander, Grecian influence was created by him. If Hellas ceased, Hellenism, the spirit of the Greek race throughout the Eastern world, at least, began its career with the conquests of Alexander.‖

Saracen power even, it rivaled Constantinople as the capital of the world by the almost fabulous wealth of its 600,000 inhabitants. It boasted the splendor of 4,000 palaces, the luxury of 5,000 baths, and provided for entertainment to the number of 400 theaters. See Sharpe, History of Egypt, (revised edition, 1877.)

* Kingsley, Alexandria and her Schools, p. 61.

† Stanley, Jewish Church, iii, 269.

‡ Surenhusius, Mishna, v, 240.

§ Philosophy of History, p. 233.

‖ Stanley, Jewish Church, iii, 261.

It is true, Hellenism, as it was carried over the world by the armies of Alexander, was already exhausted and faded. Alexander, though a disciple of Aristotle, was himself a wild graft upon the olive-tree of Hellenism; and whatever he intended to consummate by the force of his arms was, undoubtedly, less the dissemination of the Grecian spirit than the subjection of the nations under his rule. Nevertheless, a Grecian culture went along with him, which, although pretty well antiquated, was yet new to those countries. Indeed, Plutarch looked upon it as the great mission of Alexander to transplant Grecian culture into distant countries,* and to conciliate and fuse into one Greeks and barbarians. He says of him, not without reason, that he was sent of God for this purpose,† though he did not divine that this end itself was to be only subsidiary to, and the means of, a higher—to make the united peoples of the East and West more accessible for the new creation that was to proceed from Christianity, and, in the combination of the elements of Oriental and Hellenic culture, to prepare for Christianity a material in which it might develop itself.

Whatever Alexander's motive elsewhere, at the transforming of Rhacotis he sought to establish the highest forms of Greek civilization, and to produce an intellectual condition that should be the rival of Athens in her proudest day. Mind this distinguished disciple of the illustrious Aristotle but too well knew to have been the power of the Greeks; and in this African city, to become the center of the three continents of the then known earth, the Greek philosopher and Hebrew theologian were invited to take their abode, and labor until Hellenism and Judaism would effect an indissoluble union, and the world be given not only a common capital and a common language, but also a common faith.

Under the Ptolemies this desire was given a practical application. And yet the outcome of all the Ptolemæan appliances was of little or no account, if we except the great collection of manuscripts and art treasures. The wisest men, though gathered in from the most learned centers of the world, failed to produce any thing that was really worth preserving. True,

* Τὰ *βαρβαρικὰ τοῖς ἑλληνικοῖς κεράσαι, καὶ τὴν ἑλλάδα σπεῖραι.* See Plutarch's *I. Orat. de Alex. virtute s. fortuna*, § 10.

† Κοινὸς *ἥκειν θεόθεν ἁρμοστὴς καὶ διαλλακτὴς τῶν ὅλων νομίζων.* L. c. c. 6.

Grecian culture became a new element of life, but without being able to exhibit a creative power to effect healthful productions. In this new Grecian home ancient custom was adhered to; learned critical investigation and research were indulged in with the desire to adopt and reproduce the external form of ancient science and learning; there existed a pedantic, would-be learning, which was not fertilized by a native scientific energy. In physics they did but little at Alexandria; in art, nothing; in metaphysics, less than nothing. Says Kingsley:—

> You must not suppose that the philosophers whom the Ptolemies collected (as they would any other marketable article) by liberal offers of pay and patronage, were such men as the old Seven Sages of Greece, or as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. In these three last, indeed, Greek thought reached not merely its greatest height, but the edge of a precipice, down which it rolled headlong after their decease. . . . When the Romans destroyed Greece God was just and merciful. The eagles were gathered together only because the carrion needed to be removed from the face of God's earth. And at the time of which I now speak the signs of approaching death were fearfully apparent. Hapless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingcraft and the crafts of this world, and the art of profiting by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic—"how one thing cannot be predicated of another," or "how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it," and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men . . . during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian era, when was fast approaching that dark chaos of unbelief and unrighteousness which Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, even the natural instincts themselves perverted; that chaos whose darkness Juvenal and Petronius and Tacitus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate, though more righteous Jew.—Pp. 55–63.

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation very gradually became closely intermingled with them, and from this race-mixture came that superior product which gave

to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria Grecian spirit, as we have seen, was in an exhausted and faded condition; but together with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to make their homes in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment then and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliating policy, and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that this city became a center of Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbins were called "the light of Israel."*

The commercial enterprise of the race, never since extinct, now for the first time found an outlet. The Jews gradually became a separate community under their own chief, entitled ethnarch or alabarch, and represented more than a third of Alexandria, with a council corresponding to that which ultimately ruled at Jerusalem. This was the only settlement of permanent interest. Other colonies may be traced here and there under the Ptolemæan rule, in insulated fragments. One was the band of Samaritans,† who, still keeping up their deadly feud, retired to the Thebaid. Another was the group of Anchorites by the Lake Mareotis, forerunners of the parents of Christian monasticism. Another powerful community was settled at Cyrene—just become a dependency on Egypt—destined to react on the nation in Palestine ‡ by their special synagogue at Jerusalem. Another, still in the future, but drawn by the same friendly influence of the Greco-Egyptian dynasty, was the settlement at Leontopolis. In a word, the Jews had established for themselves a home in Egypt. Whether they emigrated thither only with Alexander, or whether some refugees had already gone there with Jeremiah after the dissolution of the Judæan Commonwealth, we will not investigate; they were there under the Ptolemies, fully nationalized and naturalized. Whatever there was of Grecian learning at Alexandria was brought to the very doors of the Israelite community. The museum, with its unique library, the scholars who frequented the court—Euclid the

* Herzfeld, *Geschichte Israels*, iii, 437, *et al.*

† Josephus, *Ant.*, xi, 8.

‡ Acts ii, 1; vi, 1; Herzfeld, iii, 321.

geometrician; Apelles, the painter; Eratosthenes, the grammarian—all ministered joyfully and created a most fostering atmosphere.* Soon the Grecian tongue was their language, which they employed not only in their daily life, but also in their religion, the *Jewish religion.* They went so far that they erected for themselves a temple at Leontopolis, a city in the Province of Heliopolis, which was a copy of the temple at Jerusalem. They did so not to secede from Jerusalem, to break off all connection with their mother country, but with the full consciousness that they belonged entirely to the country in which they lived, and because they desired there to fully gratify their religious wants. This temple was called, after its founder, the *Temple of Onias;* and though it was not fully recognized in Palestine, it was, nevertheless, not condemned as an idolatrous undertaking.† The temple was a visible habitation, but the spirit, the doctrine, was of far higher importance; this, too, must needs be made accessible to them in Hellenism in the Grecian language, and so the translation of the Bible was undertaken. It is true, the work was not indispensable and the need not immediate. They had not yet altogether been estranged from the Hebrew language; but, at all events, they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have mastered the book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them.‡

Once the feat accomplished, the great translation had, the Jewish community would not content themselves with ascribing to so great a work so humble an origin, and so they accounted for its existence in a legendary dress. The story took two forms. One was that King Ptolemy Philadelphus, wishing to discover the difference between the Jews and the Samaritans, summoned § five translators—three representing the Samaritans, one Jew, and one assessor. The Samaritans undertook the Pentateuch, the Jew the later books, and the king approved the Samaritan version. This was, doubtless, the

* Sharpe, *Egypt,* vii; Herzfeld, iii, 446–458.

† Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden,* iii, ch. 5. ‡ Geiger, *Judaism,* 1, 146.

§ The number five also appears in the Talmudic traditions (*Sopherim,* i, 7,) quoted in Herzfeld, iii, 536. Two names were connected with the work by tradition—Aristobulus with Exodus, Lysimachus with Esther. (Grätz, iii, 35).

Samaritan tradition. It points to the gradual growth of the work. It also may connect itself with the venerable high-priest Hezekiah,* whom Hecatæus met in Egypt, and who appears to have been the chief of the sacerdotal order, not in Jerusalem, but in Samaria. The larger story † is that of which the full account is given in the letter ascribed to Aristeas, a courtier of Ptolemy II. This account rose above the level of the sectarian differences of Jew and Samaritan, and attached itself to the wide sympathies of the great patrons of Gentile literature:

Ptolemy Philadelphus (thus ran the tale) was resolved to enrich his new library by so important a treasure as an intelligible version of the sacred books of so large a class of his subjects. Seventy-two delegates were sent from the high-priest at Jerusalem—it may be, as in the story, so as to give six from each of the twelve tribes, or in order to correspond to the sum total of the Jewish Council, or in accordance with the mystic number which pervades this and other Eastern stories.‡ A long catalogue existed of the splendid tables, cisterns, and bowls, which Josephus § describes as if he had seen them, and which are said to have been sent by Ptolemy at this time as presents to conciliate the Jewish high-priest to the work. A local tradition long pointed out the island of the Pharian light-house as the scene of their labors. There, it was believed, they pursued their work, withdrawn in that seagirt fortress from the turmoil of the streets of Alexandria, and with the opportunity of performing every morning their religious ablutions in the sea which washed their thresholds—and on the shore of which, as late as the second century, were shown the remains of the seventy,‖ or the thirty-six, cells in which the translators had been lodged, and in which (so the later Alexandrian tradition maintained) each produced by miracle exactly the same inspired version as all the rest, without one error or contradiction.

The very story, fictitious as it may be,¶ of the splendor of the reception of the translators at Alexandria, indicates the

* Josephus, *C. Ap.* Herzfeld (iii, 538) founds this conjecture on the facts, (1) that no Jewish Hezekiah is known at this time; (2) that the Samaritan high-priest in Alexander's time was Hezekiah; (3) that Hecatæus never distinguishes between the Jews and Samaritans.

† "The letter of Aristeas to Philocrates" is given in Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus*, pp. i–xxvi. For the discussions of details see *ibid.*, 1–9; Ewald, v, 249; Kuenen, iii, 171; Herzfeld, iii, 545.

‡ See Ewald, v, 252. § Josephus, *Ant.*, xii, 2, 7, 8, 9.

‖ Justin (*Cohort. ad Græcos*, c. 34) saw the seventy cells. Epiphanes, *De Pond. et Mens.*, c. vii, viii, speaks of thirty-six cells, in which they were lodged, two and two, with two scribes to each. (Comp. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii, 24.)

¶ See Ewald, History of the Jews, v, 253.

pride which was taken in the work. The eagerness of the tradition to connect the translation with the Grecian king and his universal library shows how gladly it was welcomed as a bridge between the Jewish and the Gentile world. The fantastic addition, which was made in Christian times, of the preternatural inspiration of the seventy translators, shows how readily the new takes the place of the old, and exhibits in the most striking form the transference, which has again and again occurred, of the same reverence—it may be even of the same superstition—for the new version as had formerly clung with exclusive attachment to the old.

If ever there was a translation which by its importance rose to a level with the original, it was this. It was not the original Hebrew, but the Septuagint translation, through which the religious truths of Judaism became known to the Greek and the Roman. It was the Septuagint which was the Bible of the evangelists and apostles in the first century, and of the Christian Church for the first age of its existence, which is still the only recognized authorized text of the Eastern Church, and the basis of the only authorized text of the Latin Church. Widely as it differs from the Hebrew Scriptures in form, in substance, in chronology, in language—unequal, imperfect, grotesque, as are its renderings—it has, nevertheless, through large periods of ecclesiastical history, rivaled, if not superseded, those Scriptures themselves. This substitution was, no doubt, in great measure based on the fable of the miraculous accuracy of the translation, and has led to the strongest theological confusions in the treatment of the Bible by the older Churches—which thus claim for two contradictory texts the same authority, and avowedly prefer the translation to the original.

But still, if "the noble army of translators," as they have been sometimes called, may look with affectionate veneration on Jerome's cell of Bethlehem, on Luther's study in the castle of the Wartburg, on the Jerusalem Chamber, where twice over the majestic language of the English Bible has been revised; yet the place of their most sacred pilgrimage should be the narrow, rocky islet of the Alexandrian harbor, where was kindled a brighter and more enduring beacon in the intellectual and religious sphere than even the world-renowned Pharos, which, in the maritime world, has been the parent of all the

lights that, from shore to shore and sea to sea, have guided the mariners of two thousand years.

We do not propose to follow their labor into detail, or to give the various instances of the liberties taken with the sacred text—lengthening the chronology to suit the more exacting claims of Egyptian science, softening the anthropomorphic representations of the Divinity to meet the requirements of Grecian philosophy. But we do wish to point out more clearly than we have yet done the importance of this undertaking to the literary history of that time and of the periods immediately succeeding. By the acceptance of such a version, if not by an open avowal of its need, the Jews acknowledged that Hebrew literature had come to an end. If here and there a fresh Hebrew book or a fresh Hebrew psalm might be added, their entrance was more or less covert, ambiguous, and questionable. Just as the fall of the Jewish monarchy broke into pieces the civil unity of the nation, so the abandonment of the Hebrew tongue broke into pieces the religious unity of Judaism. The Jewish race now entered the vast world of Hellenism. Henceforth any book which should win its way must be written in Greek, and not in Hebrew.* And if this was required of secular literature, it was indispensable in sacred books, for they could no longer find incorporation in any other than the Greek Bible. The tents of Shem were closed, but the doors of Japheth were expanded with a never-ending enlargement. The first pages of this Greek volume began with the Grecian translation of the Pentateuch; but its last pages were not closed until they had included the last of the writings which bore the name of St. John. This was the chief outward bond between the Jewish and the Christian Scripture. By this unity of the sacred language the beginning and end of the sacred literature were indissolubly united: and not only so, but by its intervention was filled the gap between the Old and the New Testament, thus veiling their differences under the common garb of Greek.

Into that vacant space, clothed in the same language, stole in those Greek books which in the Latin Church have been called "Deutero-canonical," and in the Protestant Churches "Apocryphal," but which in the early ages of Christianity were

* Stanley, iii, 298.

blended, under the common sanction of the Septuagint, with the earlier books, which closed with Malachi, the Chronicles, or Daniel, according to the varying order in which the Hebrew books were arranged.*

The introduction of these writings into the very heart of the ancient Scriptures has had wider consequences than is often recognized. First, it must be conceded that the effect of such additions as were made to the mixed volume, on which the religious system known as Christianity is founded, was extremely debasing, for the books of this canon partook largely of the enfeebled style, the exaggerated rhetoric, the legendary extravagance, and the rigid exclusiveness which characterized the history and literature of the nation after the return from the captivity. But, on the other hand, it should also be remembered that these additional writings—if you please, "uncanonical"—are invaluable, not only as keeping alive the continuity of the sacred literature, for they open, as it were, a postern-door into the charmed circle of the sacred books,† but also because they are, in a large measure, the preludings of a high philosophy and faith.

This is especially true of two of these writings, towering above the rest, and which, even by those who most disparage the others, are held in reverential esteem. The one, "The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach," is the recommendation of the theology of Palestine to Alexandria; the other, "The Wisdom of Solomon," is the recommendation of the theology of Alexandria to Palestine—books furnishing the links which connect the earlier Hebrew literature with that final outburst of religious teaching which is recorded in the Gospels and Epistles.

* Stanley, Jewish Church, vol. iii, lect. xlviii; Westcott, The Bible in the Church; M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia, articles Apocrypha and Canon.

† Says Stanley: "It calls our attention to the fact that there were writings which, though denied a place in the canonical Scriptures, yet glance away from the outskirts of these Scriptures into the Grecian philosophy and poetry, and have been acknowledged by grave theologians, and even by Protestant Churches, (!) to be inspired (?) by the same divine Spirit that breathed, though in fuller tones, through Isaiah or through David." This, though a testimony too enthusiastic to be unbiased, yet has in it more than a kernel of truth. There is certainly no sense in the judgment of absolute rejection of the Apocryphal writings. We need but remind of that affecting passage in the autobiography of John Bunyan, (*Grace Abounding*, pp. 62–65,) where he relates how he was for a long period at once com-

The Wisdom * of Joshua (or, as the Greeks called him, Jesus) the Son of Sirach, B. C. 180, was the first of those writings which, from the sanction given to them by the Church, were called "Ecclesiastical," as distinct from "Canonical," and thus took to itself the name "Ecclesiasticus," which properly belonged to them all. It was for the Jews of Alexandria first, and then for the Christians, "*The Church Book;*" "the favorite book of ecclesiastical edification;" † the "Whole Duty of Man," the "Imitation"—the "summary of all virtues," as it was called in its original title. In some respects it is but a repetition of the ancient writings of Solomon. In some of its maxims it sinks below the dignity of those writings by the homeliness of its details, (Ecclus. viii, 11–19; xi, 10; xiii, 2; xix, 1; xxix; xxxvii, 11,) for guidance of behavior at meals, (Ecclus. xxxi, 16,) of commercial speculations, of social advancement. But its general tone is worthy of that first contact between the two great civilizations of the ancient world, and breathes a spirit which an Isaiah would not have condemned, nor a Sophocles or a Theophrastus have despised. There is not a word in it to countenance the minute casuistries of the later rabbies, or the metaphysical subtleties of the later Alexandrians. It pours out its whole strength in discussing the conduct of human life, or the direction of the soul to noble aims. Here first in the sacred books we find the full delineation of the idea of education—the slow, gradual process, "at first by crooked ways, then will she return the (Ecclus. iv, 17,) straight way, and comfort him, and show him her secrets." "At the last thou shalt find her rest, and that shall be turned to thy joy. Then shall her fetters be a strong defense for thee, and her chains a robe of glory."

forted and perplexed by finding deep inward relief from words for which he vainly sought within the four corners of his Bible: "Look at the generations of old, and see; did ever any trust in the Lord, and was confounded?" "Then I continued," he says, "above a year, and could not find the place; but at last, casting my eyes upon the Apocrypha books, I found it in the tenth verse of the second chapter of Ecclesiasticus. This at first did somewhat daunt me, because it was not in those texts that we call holy or canonical. Yet as this sentence was the sum and substance of many of the promises, it was my duty to take the comfort of it; and I bless God for that word, for it was of good to me. That word doth still oft times shine before my face."

* It is strange that any doubt should have ever arisen on the date of Ecclesiasticus. The comparison of Haggai i, 1; ii, 1; Zech. i, 7; vii, 1; 1 Macc. xiii, 42; xiv, 27, makes it certain that ἐν τῷ ὀγδοῷ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου Βασιλέως in the Prologue can only mean "in the thirty-eighth year of King Euergetes;" and as the first Euergetes only reigned twenty-five years, the date of the translation is thus fixed to the thirty-eighth year of the second Euergetes, B. C. 132. The indication from the mention of Simon in chap. l, 1, is less certain. But the great probability in favor of identifying him with Simon II. agrees with the conclusion to be drawn from the interval between the grandfather who wrote and the grandson who translated, and this would place the original work about B. C. 180.

† A fierce attack upon it, as favoring Arianism, necromancy, and Judaic error, was published by Reynolds in 1666.

Ecclus. vi, 28. Here is a pointed warning against spoiled children: "Cocker thy child, and he shall make thee afraid; play with him, and he will bring thee to heaviness." Ecclus. xxx, 9. Here is the measure of true nobleness: "It is not meet to despise a poor man that hath understanding, neither is it convenient to magnify a sinful man. Great men and judges and potentates shall be honored, yet is there none of them greater than he that feareth the Lord. To the slave that is wise shall they that are free do service, and he that hath knowledge will not grudge when he is reformed." Ecclus. x, 23, 24. Here is the backbone of the honest love of truth: "In nowise speak against the truth, but be abashed of the error of thy ignorance." "Be not ashamed to confess thy faults, nor swim against the stream of conviction." "Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord shall fight for thee." Ecclus. iv, 25. There is a tender compassion which reaches far into the future religion of mankind: "Let it not grieve thee to bow down thine ear to the poor, and give him a friendly answer with gentleness. Be as a father to the fatherless, and instead of a husband to the widow; so shalt thou be as the son of the Most High, and he shall love thee more than thy mother doth." Ecclus. xii, 1. If there is at times the mournful and hopeless view of life and of death (Ecclus. iv, 8, 10) which pervades the earlier "Preacher," yet on the whole the tone is one of vigorous, magnanimous action. He must have been a delightful teacher who could so write of filial affection (Ecclus. iii, 12–15; vii, 28) and of friendship (Ecclus. vi, 14, 15; iv, 10; xii, 8; xix, 13; xxxvii, 2) in all its forms, and so rise above the harshness of his relations with his slaves. Ecclus. iv, 30; vii, 21; x, 25; xxxiii, 24. He must have seen deep into the problems of social life who contrasts as keenly as Bacon or Goethe the judgments of the uneducated many and the highly educated few. Ecclus. xxxviii, 24; xxxix, 11. Yet in the midst of these homely and varied experiences, which belong only to the imitator of the wise King, a voice as of the Prophet and the Psalmist is still heard. Again and again the strain is raised, such as Amos and Isaiah had lifted up, not the less impressive for the quiet soberness with which it is urged. It is the same doctrine of the substitution of the moral duties for the ceremonial. . . . "To depart from unrighteousness is propitiation." Ecclus. iii, 2, 4, 30; v, 5, 6; vii, 9, 10; xxxv, 1–7. And underneath all this there still burns the quiet flame of hope and resignation. "Look at the generations of old, and see; [it is the passage which "shone before the face" of Bunyan,] did ever any trust in the Lord, and was confounded? As his majesty is, so is his mercy." Ecclus. ii, 4–18. Both by example and by definition there is no more exalted description of the true greatness of prayer. Ecclus. xxiii, 1–6; xxxv, 17. But there is yet another characteristic of the Son of Sirach, more peculiarly his own. As the philosophy of the Hebrew Scriptures is contained in the larger part of the book—possibly from older documents—so their poetry finds a voice in the conclusion, which is beyond

question original. It is the song of praise, (Ecclus. xlii, 15–l, 29,) which, beginning with the glories of the creation, breaks forth into that "Hymn of the Forefathers," as it is called in its ancient title, to which there is no parallel in the Old Testament, but of which the catalogue of the worthies of faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews is an obvious imitation. Here and here only is a full expression given to that natural instinct of reverence for the mighty dead which has in these striking words been heard from generation to generation in the festivals of the great benefactors of Christendom, or when the illustrious of the earth are committed to the grave. "Let us now praise famous men, and the fathers that begat us." Ecclus. xliv, 1. "Their bodies (Ecclus. xliv, 14) are buried in peace, but their name liveth for evermore." It begins with the unknown sages of antiquity; it closes with the "Ultimus Judæorum," as it seemed, of his own generation, Simon the Just. Well might the grandson delight to render into Greek for the countrymen of Pindar and Pericles a roll of heroes as noble as were ever commemorated at the Isthmian games or in the Athenian Ceramicus.

The "Wisdom of the Son of Sirach" was followed, at how long an interval we know not, by "The Wisdom of Solomon." As the former book was the expression of a sage at Jerusalem with a tincture of Alexandrian learning, so *the latter book was the expression of an Alexandrian sage, presenting his Grecian ideas under the forms of Jewish history.* We feel with him the oppressive atmosphere of the elaborate Egyptian idolatry. (Wisdom xiii, 2–19; xv, 17–19.) We see through his eyes the ships passing along the Mediterranean waters into the Alexandrian harbor. (Wisdom xiv, 1–6.) We trace the footprint of Aristotle in the enumeration, word by word, of the four great ethical virtues. (Wisdom viii, 7.) We recognize the rhetoric of the Grecian sophists in the Ptolemæan Court. (Wisdom v, 9–12; xi, 17–18.) We are present at the luxurious banquets and lax discussions of the neighboring philosophers of Cyrene. (Wisdom ii, 1–7.) But in the midst of this Gentile scenery there is a voice which speaks with the authority of the ancient prophets to this new world. The book is a signal instance of the custom prevalent in the two countries before the Christian era, both in the Jewish and the Gentile world, of placing modern untried writing under the shelter of some venerable authority. No name appeared for this purpose so weighty as that of the great master of the wisdom of Israel. Solomon is evoked from the dead past to address the rulers of mankind. . . . The conception of "Wisdom" as "the personified idea of the mind in God, in creation—a mirror in which the world and mankind are ever present to him," (Döllinger, Gentile and Jew, ii, 384,) is in part derived from the ancient Solomonian theology; but it is colored by the Platonic doctrine, and lends itself to the wide development opened by the doctrine of "the Word" in Christian theology, and by the doctrine of "Law" in European philosophy. The very phrases, "love and charity," "Holy Spirit," "only be-

gotten," "manifold," "philanthropic," "Providence," "the fatherhood of God," occur here in the Greek Bible, some of them in the Greek language, for the first time, and appear not again till we find them in the New Testament. . . . And in one special quarter of the religious horizon there is a revelation which this unknown author is the first to proclaim with the authority of firm conviction and deep insight, whether to the Gentile or the Jew; namely, the revelation of "the hope full of immortality," "the immortality of righteousness." Wisdom iii, 4; i, 15. In the Psalmists and Prophets there had been bright anticipations of such a hope, inseparable from their unfailing assurance of the power and goodness of the Eternal. But it never took the form of a positive, distinct assertion. In the Grecian world a vast step forward was taken in the Platonic representations of the last teachings of Socrates. At last the seed thus sown by the doctrine of Athenian philosophy fell on the deep soil of a Hebrew faith, and struck root downward to a depth from which it has never since been eradicated, and bore fruit upward, which has sustained the moral life of Christendom to this hour. Nor is it only the force and pathos with which the truth of a future existence is urged, but the grounds on which it is based, that fill the soul and intensify the teaching of this Jewish Phædo. It is founded on those two convictions, which, alike to the most philosophic and the most simple minds, still seem the most cogent—the imperfection of a good man's existence if limited to this present life, and a firm grasp on the divine perfections. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God." "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die; but they are in peace." "He, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time." "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of his own eternity. To know God is perfect righteousness. To know his power is the root of immortality." Wisdom iii, 2; iv, 13; v, 15; xv, 31.—*Stanley.*

No wonder that this singular book has been ascribed to Philo,* of whom we shall presently have more to say, or to that other Jew of Alexandria, † who was "eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures," and in whom Luther saw the author of the mysterious Epistle to the Hebrews. No wonder that Ewald, ‡ with his usual insight, declares that "in the deep glow which, with all its apparent tranquility, streams through its veins, in the nervous energy of its proverbial style, in the depth of its representations, we have a premonition of John, and in the conception of heathenism a preparation for Paul, like a warm rustle of spring ere the time is fully come."

It certainly matters but little whether we determine that both these productions came out two centuries before or close

* Jerome, *Pref. in Lib. Salom.* † Acts xviii, 24. ‡ v, 484.

upon the dawn of the new era. They are in any case the genuine production of Alexandrian Judaism,* of the union of Greek and Hebrew thought. Of course, we would not be understood here as saying that the conflict between these two contending elements had ceased, but, rather, that we have here but too clearly manifest the tendency of these times to conciliate the Greek philosophy, such as it was then, with biblical monotheism, foreshadowing the possible ground on which the two could meet for united action after the cessation of warfare. This is no more than should be expected. It is but reasonable to suppose, ever and anon, that when there is a meeting of two such spiritual powers as Hellenism and Judaism, such as Grecian culture and Jewish religion—when two such spiritual, world-reforming powers come into conflict with each other—that conflict must necessarily result in new formations; something new will always grow out of it, be it by their antagonism or by their spiritual interpenetration; new creations will be evolved, either bearing the character of both, or pre-eminently that of one of them, yet impregnated in a certain measure by that of the other. The conflict between Hellenism and Judaism was principally a spiritual struggle, and its results a radical change in the thought and belief of both Jew and Macedonian.

Ultimately the outcome of this struggle was the formation of what came to be known as *Neoplatonism*,† a philosophy of syncretism, whose elements are partly Oriental (Alexandrian-Jewish, in particular) and partly Hellenic, but whose form is strictly Hellenic, and whose peculiarity of doctrine is that it is distinguished from Plato's own by the *principle of revelation* contained in the new philosophy.

There must have been attempts to accomplish the fusion of Hellenism and Judaism at Alexandria immediately after the completion of the Septuagint. In that Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures there is as yet no evidence of a combination of Jewish theology with Greek philosophemes. But such a combination existed probably in the dogmas of the Therapeutæ, who held certain doctrines and usages in common with the Pythagoreans.‡ It is manifestly effected by, and

§ Munk, *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, ii, 465.

† See the article in M'Clintock and Strong's Encyclopædia.

‡ Ritter, Hist. of Philos., iv, 330, *sq.*; Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, (2d ed.,) iii, b, 56, *sq.*; 368, *sq.*; Nicolas, *Doctrines Religieuses des Juif*, pp. 129, 140.

clearly revealed as a *fait accompli* in the teachings of, the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus, (about 160 B. C.) He is said to have been a Peripatetic, but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings he seems to have been the inventor of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.* His name, however, is known in connection with the theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses through a very ancient translation of the Pentateuch.† Alleging this, Aristobulus, with the facile descent of error, labored to strengthen his cause by deliberate falsifications of Greek literature—sometimes by inventing whole passages, sometimes by interpolating occasional fragments, in which the ancient Gentile poets‡ should be made to express the elevated sentiments of Hebrew monotheism. He was determined alike to find the Hebrew religion in the Greek philosophy and the Greek philosophy in the Hebrew Scriptures.§ In each of these enterprises there was a noble motive but a dangerous method. In the attempt to find the Hebrew truth in the Greek he was fired, as many a devout Jew might well have been fired, with the desire to claim in that glorious literature, now for the first time opening on the Oriental horizon, an affinity with that which was deemed most sacred in the Jewish faith.‖ It was like the Renaissance of the same literature after the night of the Middle Ages. The Jewish priest, like the mediæval ecclesiastic, was ravished with the beauty of the new vision, and longed to make it his own. But the means¶ by which he endeavored to cross the gulf which parted them was

> "A fatal and perfidious bark,
> Built in th' eclipse, and rigged with curses dark."

Yet, whatever the services of Aristobulus, or of his contemporaries and immediate successors, in the development of the Judæo-Alexandrian philosophy, or the consequent develop-

* Stanley, iii, 313; Bleek, Introduction to the Old Testament.

† Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, vii, 14; xiii, 12.

‡ Delitzsch, *Gesch. der Jüdischen Poesie*, p. 211, *sq.*

§ Nicolas, p. 129. ‖ Stanley, iii, 310.

¶ See Valckenaer, *Diatribe de Aristobulo*, Lugd. Bat., 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebii, *Præp. Evang.*; Dähne, ii, 73; Vacherot, *Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*, i, 140; Binde, *Aristobuliche Studien*, Glogau, 1869.

ment there of the Neoplatonic, it was the spirited and prolific Jewish theologian, Philo, of Alexandria, the contemporary of the founders of Christianity, who gave to ancient Hellenic thought (Plato) a Hebrew dress, and, by its union in this transformed condition with various Oriental elements of speculation, produced a syncretism, which for several centuries exercised an important influence not only on the Greek and Jewish, but also on the Christian world.*

This Philo (surnamed in Latin Judæus, *i. e.*, the Jew, in Hebrew, פילון היהודי; in Greek, *φίλων* [*ὁ*] *Ἰουδαῖος*)—the greatest of ancient, if not of all, Jewish philosophers—flourished in the first century of the Christian era, and was, therefore, a contemporary of Jesus the Christ, and of several of his apostles. Regarding Philo's personal circumstances we find information in Josephus,† Eusebius,‡ Hieronymus,§ Suidas, Isidorus Pelusiota, Photius.‖ Later writers mention him as Jedediah the Alexandrine.¶ The most reliable informations are occasional notices contained in the Philonic writings, especially in the two works *Legatio ad Caium* and *Contra Flaccum*. According to these Philo was a native, and throughout life a resident, of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A. D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the Emperor Caligula, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Cesar.** He was then probably about

* There can be no doubt that from the earliest efforts of the Church in the formularization of Christian doctrine as a theological system, the philosophy of Plato entered largely into the speculations of patristic divines, furnished them with methods of reasoning against the subtle crochets which, under the name of "heresies," cropped up so abundantly in those inquisitive times, and controlled the solemn definitions which were accepted by common consent as dogmas of the faith. From the position which Philo occupied in the Jewish world we may easily conclude that his works would be among the most influential channels through which this stream of Greek wisdom joined the rising current of Christian theology. See Gfrörer, *Kritische Gesch. des Christenthums*, vol. i; Dähne, *Jüdisch-Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii; Schürer, *Lehrb. der N. T. Zeitgesch.*, 1874, p. 619; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i, 22; Matter, *Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis l'ère Chrétienne*, Paris, 1854.

† Antiquities, xviii, 8, 1; xx, 5, 2.

‡ *Histor. Eccles.*, ii, 4, *sq.*

§ *Vir. Illustr.*

‖ Cod. cv.

¶ Beer, *Jüdische Sekten.*, 1, 97.

** Josephus, Ant., xviii, 8, 1; comp. *De Legat. ad Caium*, xxviii.

sixty years old. If so, he was born about B. C. 20, and was contemporary with all the important events of the New Testament. He went again to Rome in the reign of Claudius, but after this nothing is known with certainty of his whereabouts. Philo had a brother employed in the affairs of government at Alexandria, named Alexander Lysimachus, who is supposed to be the Alexander mentioned in Acts iv, 6, as a man "of the kindred of the high-priest." That Philo was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus,* and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is also reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. In fact, we may suppose that he would himself have claimed the name of a Pharisee by the same test which St. Paul preferred in his own case, "the hope and resurrection of the dead." That he was no Sadducee is abundantly clear from the prominent places which "angels and spirits" occupy in his theological system. Philo was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by contemporary Jews of his social condition† he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world, and the home of revived Hellenism. His learning is very clearly attested, moreover, by the number of Greek writers, especially poets, quoted in his works: Homer, Hesiod, Solon, Theognis, Pindar, Æschylus, Ion, Sophocles, Euripides; the fabulist Æsop; the physician Hippocrates; the historians Thucydides and Xenophon; the geographer Eratosthenes; and the philosophers Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Bias, Pythagoras, Ocellus Lucanus, Hippasus, Philolaus, Empedocles, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno Eleaticus, Heraclitus, Democritus, Anaxarchus, Antisthenes, Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Heraclides, Critolaus, Epicurus, Diogenes, Zeno the Stoic, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Boethius, Panætius, Posidonius.‡

Besides philosophy Philo entirely mastered the whole Alexandrine biblical science. He knew thoroughly all those various explanations of the Bible, especially of the law, some al-

* Ant., xviii, 8, 1. † Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, viii, 13. ‡ Hersfeld, ii, 465.

legorical, some strictly literal, which were in vogue at his time among the Jews, for he often quotes, criticises, or approves them. It is, therefore, most absurd for Scaliger or Cudworth to assert that he was ignorant of Jewish literature and customs; and Fabricius and Mangey have most clearly shown that such a view is entirely groundless. The supposition of his ignorance of Hebrew must have arisen from the fact that the Jews of Alexandria at this time were so little acquainted with the original of the Old Testament Scriptures that they had to be supplied with the Septuagint and other Greek versions. But even Geiger, who says that Philo had but a schoolboy knowledge of the Hebrew language, concedes that when the translation of the Bible was undertaken for the Alexandrian Jews "they had not yet been altogether estranged from the Hebrew language." As absurd as is this charge of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew is the charge that Philo's Greek is unclassical, and this because he was a Jew. As well might we say of the Jewish *literati* of Germany that their style is Jewish-German, and not the pure tongue of Lessing and Gervinus. Philo's Greek was, of course, not that of Plato, nor the pure Attic of Demosthenes. No one at Alexandria wrote so purely, but Philo wrote as did his contemporaries, and as wrote the best of them. In his treatise *De Congressu*, xiv, Philo refers himself to his own attainments in grammar, philosophy, geometry, music, and poetry; and his accomplished and beautiful character was thus gracefully attested by his wife, who, when once asked why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, replied, "The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife." *

The circumstance that Philo was contemporary with New Testament events, coupled with his high intelligence and interest in sacred learning, as well as with the fact that he once visited Jerusalem "to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the temple," (although only one such visit is referred to,† his piety and devotion probably prompted occasional repetitions of this pilgrimage, which were less likely to be mentioned because of his modesty and reserve in personal matters,) led ancient writers to connect Philo intimately with Christianity.

* *Fragments*, ed. Richter, vi, 236.

† Richter's ed. of *Fragments*, vi, 200.

Photius * makes him a friend of the Apostle Peter; as do also Eusebius,† Jerome,‡ and Suidas. Photius goes so far as to say that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church, but afterward fell from it. While we have no direct means of testing the truth of such statements, they certainly do not bear evidence on their face. A man of such decided characteristics as Philo could no more have remained quiet after conversion than did Saul of Tarsus, and, because we have no utterances from him as a Christian, we have reason to reject the story as fabulous from first to last. Besides, Philo's own extant writings do not give the slightest reference to any such important step, and this fact tells even more strongly, if possible, against the report.

We are not quite so sure ourselves that Simon Peter was ever at Rome, and it is, therefore, a grave question in our mind whether Philo in his probably oft repeated visits to the eternal city ever could have encountered this leader of the personal disciples of Christ and special apostle to the Jews. But it would be curious to speculate, if we could venture to do so, on the talk that might be imagined to pass between the princely diplomatist of Alexandria and the boatman of the Galilean lake. For the main object of Philo's life, as we gather from many recondite treatises which he has left behind him, was to build up on the old Jewish faith a religious system which should meet the spiritual wants of all mankind. With such speculations working in his mind, it might well be supposed that he would have taken great interest in the story of the carpenter's Son of Nazareth, and the Gospel which he had committed to his followers for proclamation throughout the whole world—an interest, we may assume, of a somewhat patronizing and supercilious sort. For Simon Peter might be supposed to tell how the Gospel of which he talked was to be "preached to the poor," whereas Philo was intent on a reconciliation between Jewish theology and the demand for a practical religion preferred on behalf of abstract reasoners and students of deep philosophy—the broad-browed thinkers who mustered under the Painted Porch of Athens, or held high disputations in the groves of the Lyceum. It is curious, too, to trace the several fates of the popular and philosophical

* *Bibl. Cod.*, xv. † *Hist. Eccles.*, ii, 17. ‡ *Catal. Script. Eccles.*

movements, as associated with the two contemporaries, even if they never came into contact with each other. In these our modern days, the writings sent out by the "Fisherman of Galilee" hold their potency in the realms of the Cesars, and far beyond, in countries unknown to them; and day by day the territory enlarges, and fast hastens the hour when the whole world shall own them, revere their author, and bless that kind Providence which inspired such teachings. But how about the writings which Philo has left behind? How many are there who, in the course of every year, care to brush the dust from his volumes as they rest in some old-world college library, or to find out for themselves how he proposed to deal with the great problems which were offering themselves for solution about the opening of the Christian era? Nevertheless, the thought and inquiry which Philo represented had a very important influence on the early history of Christianity; and, if only for the sake of the man's own eloquence and earnestness, it will well repay the inquirer of the history of intellectual development to ascertain the worth and honesty of those efforts which this noble Jew made to furnish a form of religion to his fellowmen, at one of the most, if not the most, critical period in the history of human thought.

## ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Nuncio and the Two Vicars Apostolic: Adda, Leyburn, and Giffard. 2. Positivism and Evolutionism. 3. A Catholic Poet of the Seventeenth Century. 4. Professor Huxley on Evolution. 5. Hunting Sitting Bull. 6. The Relations of the Church and the Constitution of the United States. 7. Syriac Grammars.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, Octobor, 1877. (Philadelphia.)—1. Cyprian. 2. Baptist Succession. 3. Time of the Second Advent. 4. George Fox and the Early Friends. 5. Philosophy without Assumptions. 6. Baptism and Remission. 7. Scope of Effective Sunday-School Instruction.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, October, 1877. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Of Repentance. 2. The Laic Priesthood. 3. Misdevelopment of the Lutheran Church in America. 4. Rev. David F. Bittle, D.D. 5. What We are to Live on. 6. The Nature of Language. 7. Thesis on the Galesburgh Rule.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1877. (Boston.)—1. Three Races, Three Empires, and Three Religions. 2. Creation De Nihilo. 3. Judas Iscariot, the Apostate: His Sin, Repentance, and Death. 4. Force not the Equivalent of Personality. 5. Cushite Origin of the Sacred Writing, Language, and Literature of Babylon. 6. Sir James Edward Smith.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1877. (Andover.)—1. The Difficulties of the Concept of God. 2. Atonement. 3. The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament. 4. President Finney's System of Theology in its Relations to the So-called New England Theology. 5. Identification of Succoth and Penuel. 6. Note on Genesis xi, 26. 7. Is Παρθένος the Correct Rendering of עלמה in Isaiah vii, 14? 8. The Theological Journals of Germany.

In the third article Dr. M'Ilvaine, who takes pains to avow his full faith in the inspiration of the Old Testament as well as of the New, undertakes to solve some of the problems which have troubled many thoughtful students of the Scriptures, who have committed the mistake of examining institutions and events of a darker age by the light of Christianity and the nineteenth century. We will let him state for himself the principle laid down:—

The moral and spiritual light of the New Testament is superior to that of the Old; in other words, the revelations of the old dispensation were not complete or final, but partial, in great part provisional, and necessarily accommodated to the low intellectual, moral, and spiritual condition of the people to whom they were originally communicated. . . . It is certain from all human experience, that truths, ideas, and even rules of moral conduct, which present no difficulty to people of developed and cultivated faculties, cannot be received, nor even comprehended, by those who are in comparatively a low state of intellectual culture, moral sensibility, and spiritual enlightenment, such as, beyond a question, was that of the Israelites in the time of Moses. For they were a vast horde of emancipated slaves, just escaped from centuries of degrading and corrupting bondage, among a people wholly given to the grossest idolatries and superstitions. Consequently they were incapable of receiving those high and pure and spiritual revelations of God and divine things which we have in the New Testament. These would have made no impression upon their unsusceptible moral and spiritual faculties—upon what Christ called the hardness of their hearts; for which reason, as he explained to the Pharisees, they were accommodated by Moses, in one case at least, with an inferior rule of moral conduct—a significant case which will come up hereafter. A national education of fifteen hundred years in the doctrines of the unity of God, and of the expiation of guilt by a sin-bearer, as well as in many other things, was indispensable to prepare them for the reception of the Gospel as revealed by Christ and his apostles. The proof of this is, that God actually subjected them to such a course of training and preparation under their ritual and moral laws, the ministry of their prophets, and

the discipline of their wonderful providential history. And thus, in the fullness of time, they were actually prepared for the superior light of the new dispensation.—Pp. 675, 676.

Having been placed under the educating discipline of the Mosaic law, it was evidently deemed indispensable to the great end sought, that the Hebrew people should be completely separated from all other nations; and this procedure must carry with it all its necessary consequences. Among them was the command to exterminate the previous inhabitants of the land, on which we have the following:—

Now the difficulty here is not whether it was right thus to destroy, root and branch, a people whose cup of iniquity was full. Of this there can be no question with any who believe in the providence of God. For it was under his providential government that these nations, like Sodom and Gomorrah, Pompeii and Herculaneum, were actually destroyed. But the difficulty is this: how the giving of such commands to his moral creatures—how his requiring of them to slay without pity such multitudes of their fellow-creatures, including, of necessity, the aged and infirm, parents and children, infants at the breast, nursing mothers, women with child, and in their travail sorrows—how all this is to be reconciled with the character of God, the teaching of Christ, and, especially, with his law of love to enemies, and pity for the feeble and suffering. We do not write for those, if any such there be, who cannot feel that there is any difficulty here.

It may not, indeed, be possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give a solution of this difficulty which shall be perfectly satisfactory. For we are surrounded by mysteries in the providence of God—undeniable facts—which no created mind can fathom. But it is essential to the account here given us, that the agency of the children of Israel in this destruction of the Canaanites should be regarded as a solemn judicial act, in execution of the judgment of God upon a people whose moral corruptions were such that their continued existence upon the earth could be no longer tolerated; whose extermination, moreover, was indispensable in order that the covenant people might be effectually separated from their corrupting influence; in other words, that the whole object for which Israel had been called out of the world, and consecrated to the work of making the necessary preparation for the coming of Christ and the blessings of the Gospel, might not be frustrated. Hence its justification is placed upon this ground by God himself in the words, "Thou shalt consume all the people. . . . They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee to sin against me; for if thou serve their gods it will surely be a snare unto thee." And so it proved, wherever they failed to obey these commands, in all their subsequent history. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the highest and most spiritual

laws of morality had not yet been revealed, nor could be, as is proved by the fact, until the time should come when the necessity for this outward separation of the people from other nations should cease. The commands which were given to them upon this subject, as upon all others, had to be accommodated to the degree of moral light which they were capable of receiving, and they could not go beyond it. Hence this whole transaction must be regarded as belonging to a lower moral condition than that for which it was intended to prepare, though, doubtless, to the highest which it was possible in consistency with the necessity of thus keeping the covenant people sequestered from the influence of the heathen.—Pp. 686, 687.

As illustrative of the abrogation by our Lord of allowances of the law of Moses in accommodation to the moral capacities of the people, we may take the case of

DIVORCE.

Christ, by his own authority, totally abrogates that freedom of divorce which had been previously allowed. For we find nothing in the law to restrain any man from putting away his wife, or wives, at his own pleasure, nor from marrying other women, nor women so divorced from marrying other men. On the contrary, all these customs were tolerated in the following prescribed form: "When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand, and send her out of his house; and when she is departed, she may go and be another man's wife." And, from the manner in which such divorces are referred to by the later prophets, as also our knowledge of human nature, we may be sure that they ultimately became very common, and an evil of enormous magnitude. . . . But the great reason why this freedom was tolerated must have been that which our Lord himself gives, in this passage, where he abrogates it in the most unequivocal manner: "It was said, Whosoever will put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is [so] divorced committeth adultery." Now, when the Pharisees objected to this doctrine on the ground that Moses had authorized them thus to repudiate their wives, he admits the fact as undeniable, and assigns as a reason for this toleration the hardness of their hearts, which rendered them incapable of receiving any better or more perfect rule of moral conduct. At the same time he reiterates his own prohibition of what Moses had allowed, and on the ground that it was not in accordance with the eternal laws of morality—"from the beginning it was not so"—and affirms on his own authority, as before, that if they should continue to practice it they would incur the guilt of adultery:

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is [so] put away doth commit adultery."—Pp. 702–704.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, November, 1877. (Boston.) 1. Resumption of Specie Payments. 2. Cavalier de la Salle. 3. The War in the East. 4. The Functions of Unbelief. 5. The Southern Question. 6. Michelangelo and the Buonarroti Archives. 7. America in Africa, Part II. 8. The Situation in France. 9. How shall the Nation Regain Prosperity? Part III. 10. The Ultramontane Movement in Canada.

In the article on "The Southern Question," one of the ablest in this brilliant number, Mr. Charles Gayarré, a Louisianian, vividly describes the terribleness of the whirlwind reaped in the last few years by those who for two centuries sowed the wind, and, no doubt, correctly, the feelings which prevail among the whites of the South, with the purpose on his part of enlightening the North and West respecting them. The problem requiring solution is this: How shall the freedmen live in harmony with their former masters? or, more explicitly, since this is made to turn on the question of race, How shall the free negro and the Caucasian live peacefully together on the same soil?

The fundamental mistake of our Southern brethren after the war was in such treatment of the freedmen as made the gift of the ballot by a constitutional amendment the necessary security of their freedom. It is confessedly a perilous power in the hands of ignorant men. The greatest danger to the Republic is in its million and a half entitled to vote and unable to read; and of these seventy per cent. is in the Southern States. But, be it remembered, also, that the very people who proposed to save the freedman by the ballot have freely poured millions of money into the South in efforts to educate him for his new

responsibilities, and thus avert the danger; and, notwithstanding the barbarous burning of school-houses and expulsion of teachers, it has been continued to this hour. Their second mistake was in the omission to accept the situation and do what they now propose, namely, to influence the negro vote by superior intelligence and persuasion. A large amount of the mischief and misrule of later days might thus have been prevented, and the question of race avoided. The claim of office on the ground of race or nationality is always bad, in State or Church. The color line, regardless of intelligence or capacity, is the worst possible line. But, asks our author, "Suppose our negroes were transported to Massachusetts, and composed half of the population of that Commonwealth, would the sons of the sturdy old Puritans melt into such tender philanthropy as to permit those negroes to occupy half of the offices of that State, and claim one of the two Senators and half of the Representatives in Congress?" Assuredly, no: Massachusetts would give nothing *because* of color, while her sons would both use the ballot and respect its decisions. In the case supposed, that venerable Commonwealth, which expends for education about sixteen dollars per annum to every person of school age, while Georgia expends forty-five cents, would at once multiply her school-houses, and compel the attendance at school of every child of from five to sixteen years of age; she would probably require ability to read as a condition of suffrage; she would certainly demand, as now, the pre-payment of the poll-tax of two dollars; and she would protect the voter at the ballot-box against all comers. The last thing she would do would be to threaten to kill off the negroes that white men might rule. The true solution of the Southern question is—*the school-house.* It is, indeed, conceded that white and black should have "equal opportunity for education," but the value of the concession depends on the amount given. Let Georgia expend eleven dollars per scholar, as does Ohio, instead of forty-five cents, and let South Carolina substitute the eight dollars of Illinois for her own forty cents, and the school system of the South will inaugurate a new civilization.

THE SOUTHERN REVIEW, October, 1877. (Baltimore.)—1. Education: The Study of Mathematics. 2. Fashion in Funerals and Graveyards. 3. The Two Genealogies of Christ. 4. The Bell. 5. Edwards on the Will. 6. The Gospel according to St. John. 7. The Microscope in Common Life. 8. Arminian Inconsistencies and Errors.

Doctor Bledsoe is justly indignant at the renewal of the old attempt to stigmatize Methodists as Pelagians. He pronounces it "a disgrace to the theological literature of the South," and he might have added, to its intelligence as well. "It is simply a calumny," he says, "in which no Christian man or gentleman ought to indulge." Is there in all the South no Moses Stuart to tell his brethren, as did he of Andover a few years since, that they are guilty of slander?

The Calvinistic dogma of the guilt of original sin, and its pedigree, are thus treated:—

> Viewed in the light of reason, the dogma that what we bring into the world with us, as the sad inheritance of Adam's sin and self-corruption, is our own proper and personal sin, for which we deserve eternal "wrath and damnation," appeared to us to be inconceivably monstrous. This inherited evil was our misfortune, and not our fault; it was a depravity of our nature, and not a sin; but *in itself it is not sin.* That is, it leads to all sin, as temptation leads the will, but not as an efficient cause produces its effect. Otherwise the will would not be free in sinning, or responsible for its sinful acts.
>
> When we came, in the light of history, to trace this Calvinistic dogma to its source, its existence ceased to surprise us. We saw, in the first place, that during the first four centuries of the Church all the fathers held the doctrine of natural depravity as above stated. They called it, with one voice, the "disease," the "disorder," the "depravity," or the "corruption," of our nature; but they denied that it was sin, or was deserving of punishment. As late as the year A. D. 253 it was denied by the council of sixty-six bishops, with Cyprian at their head, that infants had any sin of their own; and yet they decided that infants, dying unbaptized, would be lost. Lost for what? Lost, and lost forever, because their parents neglected to have them baptized? And could the "priest" save them from hell, from "God's wrath and damnation," by sprinkling them with a little holy water? These questions, grave as they were, and awful, seemed not to have been seriously considered for nearly a century and a half after this council of 253. It was in the beginning of the fifth century that the genius of Pelagius was aroused and called into active hostility by the monstrous dogma of the damnation of unbaptized infants who die in infancy. This brought him into collision with Augustine. "Lost for what?" said he. "Lost merely because they were not baptized?" "No," an-

swered Augustine, after much hesitation, wavering, and uncertainty, "Not lost merely because they were not baptized, but because the *guilt* of 'original sin' justly exposed them to 'God's wrath and damnation.'" Both disputants became heretics in the course of the controversy; that is, both departed from all the former teaching of the Church. Pelagius did so by denying that the posterity of Adam received any harm or hurt in consequence of his sin, and Augustine, by asserting that the depraved nature inherited by us is truly and properly sin, which deserves "the fire prepared for the devil and his angels." We have shown in the first article of this Review, for July, 1877, how and by what means the heresy of Augustine put down and crushed the heresy of Pelagius.

The great reformer Luther, the Augustinian monk, brought the heresy of Augustine out of the Church of Rome with him, and it was embodied in the second article of the Augsburg Confession. The reformers of the Church of England, as the Bishop of Ely has truly said, derived from that article of the Augsburg Confession the dogma that "original sin," in every one that is born into the world, "deserveth God's wrath and damnation;" and in these awful words, incorporated it into her "Ninth Article."—Pp. 473–475.

But, as is afterward shown, Mr. Wesley, in framing the Articles for his Methodist Episcopal Church, struck out this whole Calvinistic clause.

NOTE.—Since writing the above we have received news of the decease of the able editor. His Quarterly will be continued at any rate to the close of the year 1878.

## *English Reviews.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1877. (London.)—1. The Consensus of the Reformed Confessions. 2. The Testimony of Paul to Christianity, according to the Tubingen School. 3. Church Life in the Nineteenth Century—Geneva and Scotland. 4. On the Revision of the Westminster Confession. 5. Incarnation and Resurrection: the Essentials of Christianity. 6. The Place of the Psalms in Modern Apologetic. 7. The Early Celtic Church: Its Doctrines and Constitution Examined and Compared with those of the Contemporary Catholic Church. 8. The Study of the Old Testament in 1876.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (London.)—1. King René of Anjou. 2. The Sects of the Commonwealth. 3. Jules Michelet. 4. George Buchanan. 5. Thomas De Quincey. 6. The Greek Revolution. 7. The Social Question in Sicily.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Memoirs of Odilon-Barrot. 2. History of the Mongols. 3. Cæsarism, Romanism, Socialism: the Three Extreme Ideals. 4. Carriages, Roads, and Coaches. 5. Contemporary Italian Poets. 6. The Lobster, Crab, and Oyster Fisheries. 7. Alfred Austin's Poems. 8. The New Republic and Modern Philosophers. 9. Ordination and Confession. 10. The Liberal Party and Foreign Politics.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1877. (London.)—1. Memoir of Charles Kingsley. 2. Thomas De Quincey. 3. Scottish Ecclesiastical Biographies. 4. Calvin and Servetus. 5. Mohammedanism. 6. The Wesleyan Methodist Atlas. 7. Naville's Julian the Apostate and Polytheism.

That Calvin was mainly responsible for the burning of Servetus is the long-since recorded judgment of history. The ugly fact remains a dark blot on the fame of the great reformer, whatever explanation of it we may adopt. Let us, if possible, acquit him of personal malice, though it is not easy to do so in view of his letter to Favel, then pastor at Neuchatel, referring to annotations made by Servetus upon a copy of the Institutes lent him by Calvin. "Servetus wrote to me lately," he says, "and, beside his letter, sent me a volume full of his ravings, telling me with audacious arrogance that I should there find things stupendous and unheard of until now. He offers to come here if I approve; but I will not pledge my faith to him; for did he come, if I have any authority here, I should never suffer him to go away alive." Calvin believed in and defended the right of the civil magistrate to punish heresy, holding still the lesson of intolerance taught him in his training for the Romish priesthood.

Of Servetus the world has known little. Dr. Willis, a physician, has given the public the fullest account of him ever written, having had his attention called to him as a practitioner of medicine near Lyons, and especially to a chapter in one of his works, treating of the circulation of the blood through the lungs, and anticipating in some respects the discovery of Harvey. Servetus was born in Arragon, and educated at the University of Saragossa. Like Calvin, he was intended for the Church, but after a time renounced his purpose and studied law. Associated in some capacity with the emperor's confessor, perhaps as private secretary, he was present at the coronation of Charles V., and at the Diet of Augsburg. His first work, *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, was published in Switzerland; but, notwithstanding the liberality of the Swiss reformers, with whom he had formed an acquaintance, he was compelled to seek safety in Paris, where he connected himself with the university, taking the name of Villeneuve, from the place of his birth. There, not long afterward, he met Calvin and discussed with him the doctrines of his book. We next find him at Lyons reading for a publishing house, and editing Ptolemy's

Geography, supplementing it with ample notes, among which was the unfortunate statement that Judea was not then a land flowing with milk and honey. Here, also, he studied medicine. Returning to Paris, he won the reputation of "a man most illustrious in every class of letters, and scarcely second to any in the science of Galen."

Thirteen years thus elapsed after the meeting with Calvin, when Servetus began a correspondence with him, professedly making inquiries for the truth in some matters of theology. Ere long, however, he assumed the tone of a critic, and outraged Calvin by his want of deference and his unorthodoxy. This was followed by the letter to Favel, the original of which, in Calvin's own handwriting, is still in the Paris Library. But the great offense of Servetus was in his *Christianismi Restitutio*, printed secretly, a copy of which was sent to Calvin in confidence. As this book was the cause of all his woes, let us see what the doctrines were for which he lost his life:—

They are a strange mixture of the experimental doctrines of Christianity with theosophic reasonings which make them utterly void. In dealing with the former he speaks of faith as "the first element, an emotion rather than a recognition, a spontaneous movement of the heart, not an act of the understanding, its essence being belief in the man Jesus Christ as being the Son of God." Its effects are described in terms identical with those which would be employed by any evangelical divine of the present day. He makes but little of the Fall. Yet he admits the efficacy of Redemption, only it is regarded, in accordance with a theory of an earlier age, as designed not to satisfy divine justice, but to "traverse the devil in the rights he had acquired by guile." Men will not, however, be condemned for Adam's sin, but only for their own. The finally impenitent will be annihilated. . . . In reference to God and the creation he says that the world is "a manifestation and communication of God in time and space, manifestation taking place through the word, communication through the agency called Spirit." All existence as derived from God is to be accounted divine, although in diverse degrees. An archetypal universe existed before the actual world came into being, and this is the Logos, a virtual and potential Son, but not an actual co-eternal Son. The Son first acquired form and substance in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and was made participant of the Spirit when he began to breathe. The Spirit, however, is but an abstraction. And Christ is the Demiurgos, who created the world. He is truly the Son of the eternal God, being engendered by the Father of the Virgin Mary,

but not the eternal Son of God for the same reason. The distinctions of the Trinity are purely formal. God is essentially in all things, and all things essentially in God.—Pp. 112, 113.

Calvin was himself too great a heretic to be listened to on a charge of heresy by the Roman Catholic authorities of Vienne, but he could reach the same result by indirection. He persuaded a young man at Geneva to write to a relative at Lyons, and furnished from the book the evidence to be laid before the clerical authorities, taking care to keep himself in the background. Servetus was arrested on this information and tried, but managed to escape before sentence, with the connivance, it is believed, of some of his judges. He was condemned in his absence to the flames, but, as he had fled, his effigy was burned, as was also his book. He betook himself to Switzerland, and after some months of wandering, came to Geneva. He did not intend to stay, and yet he most strangely remained. A month elapsed before Calvin gained knowledge of his presence there, but on learning it he promptly denounced him, and caused his arrest. It was his hand that within twenty-four hours drew up the bill of thirty-eight charges, founding them on the *Christianismi Restitutio*, though La Fontaine was put forward as the formal accuser. These charges mostly referred to the theological opinions of Servetus, yet one was of defaming Calvin and the Church of Geneva. Whether on coming to Geneva he allied himself with the popular party that was then struggling with Calvin for power, and seeking to expel him a second time from the city, does not appear; certain it is that the Libertines, as they were called, espoused his cause and rallied to his defense, doubtless in the hope of using him to gain their own ends; and with equal facility they dropped him when they saw that they were on the losing side.

A probable case having been made out, the affair came into the hands of the Attorney General, who framed a fresh indictment, and pressed the trial forward, Calvin taking an important part in the proceedings. He even brought up the passage about Judea, and insisted that "whoever asserted that Judea did not flow with milk and honey sinned against the Holy Ghost." The prisoner's cross-examination continued for a fortnight, and included not only his theological speculations, but such irrelevant matters as the way of his escape from

Vienne, and his reasons for never having married. No evil was proved upon him except his heresies. At the request of the Council, the pastors tried to bring him to a recantation, but in vain. Calvin then prepared a new bill of thirty-eight charges. Some time was spent in the hearing, when the cantons were consulted, Servetus, perhaps, originating the proposal under the advice of the Libertines. But while awaiting their answers Calvin wrote to a friend, "I hope for a capital sentence at all events;" and he was gratified.

It would seem as if Servetus apprehended small danger from the present proceeding, if we may judge by his attitude toward Calvin in the interval. He boldly arraigns him on four "great and notable" charges, taxes him with the instigation of the Vienne trial, and demands in virtue of the *lex talionis* that he shall be sent to prison till the cause is decided between them. Still, at times he seems to have had forebodings, for we find him in a letter to a friend speaking in terms that clearly point to the dreadful issue. During the present interval also a demand was made by the Roman Catholic tribunal at Vienne that the prisoner should be given up to its tender mercies. Servetus was offered the choice between returning to Vienne and awaiting the result of the appeal to the States. He preferred the latter alternative. The former he knew would be certain death, since public attention had been fixed upon his errors.

And now the answers of the four councils and the four consistories came. With a unanimity which does not say much for their realization of the true nature of that religious liberty whose foremost exponents they ought to have been, these four bands of Christian pastors and these four companies of Christian laymen gave their sentence for death. . . . Any scruples that may have been felt to an extreme course were now at an end. The express sanction of the four cantons had been given to it, and to this was added the moral influence of the thoroughly aroused Romanist authorities at Vienne. . . . The following resolution was carried by a majority of votes: "Having a summary of the process against the prisoner, Michael Servetus, and the reports of the parties consulted before us, it is hereby resolved, and, in consideration of his great errors and blasphemies, decreed, that he be taken to Champnel, and there burned alive; that this sentence be carried into effect on the morrow, and that his books be burned with him."

The news fell like a thunder-clap on Servetus's ear. "Only imparted to him in the early morning of the day on which he was doomed to die, he was at first as if struck dumb by the intelligence. He did but groan aloud and sigh as if his heart would burst; and when he recovered speech at length, it was only to rave like one demented, to strike his breast, and cry in

his native speech, '*Misericordia! misericordia!*' By degrees, however, he recovered his self-possession and became calm." Some have contrasted this outburst with the calmness of the orthodox martyrs, as intimating that his principles failed to support him in the hour of trial. But it was only a momentary agitation, arising from the suddenness of the blow that dashed all earthly hopes. His constancy after this did not fail. He requested an interview with Calvin, and "desired to ask his pardon." There was no word of recantation on his lips: the faults he wished to confess to Calvin were those of heated speech, and no doubt of deep-rooted enmity. Calvin replied that he had not prosecuted him on personal grounds, and strove, but in vain, to convince him of his errors. . . . Whatever errors there may have been either in doctrine or practice, no one can refuse to Servetus the praise of having met his fate with heroic courage. He died by fire on October 27, 1553, exclaiming with his last breath, "Jesu, thou Son of the eternal God, have compassion on me!"

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Torpedo Warfare. 2. The Philosopher Choo-Foo-Tsze. 3. Souvenirs of Countess d'Agoult. 4. Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths. 5. Prince Hardenberg's Memoirs. 6. The Order of the Coif. 7. Mr. Anthony Trollope's Novels. 8. Lyte's Eton College. 9. The Story of an Indian Life. 10. The Russian Invasion of Turkey.

Ulfilas translated the Scriptures into Gothic, the language of Alaric and Theodoric, having first invented its alphabet, about the middle of the fourth century. The Codex Argenteus, in the University of Upsal, and a few palimpsests in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, are all that remain. The philological student will be pleased to observe the identity in essence of the language with our own, and the explanation afforded of some of our dialectical peculiarities.

Take the complaint of the Jews, in John vi, 60: *Hardu ist thata waurd: whas mag this hausjan?* It only needs, as to the last word, that we should be reminded of the interchangeableness of *s* and *r*, and that we should further compare the German *hören*, (to hear,) and the sentence will at once read off into English: "Hard is that word; what (man) may hear this?"

Again, when we find in the 15th chapter of John that *frijan* = "to love," and that *jus frijonds meinai sijuth* = "you are my friends," (that is, they who love me;) and when we further find that *fijan* = "to hate," and the participle *fijands* = "one who hates, an enemy;" we then at once perceive how it has come to pass that *friend* and *fiend*, so like in form, have such different meanings; though it is true that the difficulty still remains, to understand how our Teutonic ancestors could allow that one little letter *r* to bridge over the vast gulf between loving and hating. From *fiend* to *ogre*, however, is an easier trapsition; and when we find in Luke i, 30, as part of the angelic salutation, *Ni*

*ogs thus Mariam*, "*Fear* not, thou, Mary," we at once understand that an ogre was originally any thing that causes fear.

With this word *fijan* for a clue, we can now thread our way through a longer verse, the 26th of the 14th chapter of Luke. *Jabai whas gaggith* (pronounce the double *g* as *ng*) *du mis jah ni fijaith attan seinana jah aiththein, jah quen, jah barna, jah brothruns, jah svistruns, nauhuth-than seina silbins saivala, ni mag meins siponeis visan.* "If who" (= any one) "gangs to me, and hates not his father and mother," (in the Gothic equivalents of these words we have an extraordinary deviation from a very wide-spread type,) "and his wife," (the Gothic for woman has risen into *queen* by a converse process to that by which the Italian *donna* has descended into woman,) "and his bairns, and his brothers and his sisters, and still then" (nauh = German noch) "his self's soul," (compare the Scotch *sawl* and the German *seele*,) "he may not be my disciple."

We spoke of the study of our own dialects, as being illustrated by the labors of Ulfilas. In the northern, and, we believe, in some of the eastern counties of England, the word to *wilt* is used of the decay of fruit, (as, "these pears have wilted;") and this dialectical word, like so many others, is retained in the American vocabulary, though in a rather different sense. Thus, in describing an action in the American Civil War, a journalist wrote, "Our troops wilted," (ran away.) This word is accounted for by the Gothic *ga-swiltan*, to die. Again, the Yorkshire *mickle* and the Scotch *meikle* correspond to *mikils*, the regular Gothic equivalent of great. The Scotch *sib* (of kin to) is represented by the Gothic *sibja*, (relationship.) When a north-countryman says, "*I'm ganging to my bairns*," he speaks, as the texts above quoted show us, almost pure Gothic. We may have been sometimes puzzled to know why Londoners now talk of *shop-lifting*, and why the Scotch borderers used to talk of *cattle-lifting*. But when we read the beautiful Gothic translation of the tenth chapter of John, we see at once that "to lift," in the sense of "to rob," is a rightful Teutonic word. *Saei inn ni atgaggith thairh daur in gardan lambe ak steigith aljathro*, ("He that goes not in through the door into the yard of the lambs, but mounts another way,") "*sah hliftus ist jah vaidedja*," ("he is a thief and an evildoer.")—Page 191.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1877. (New York.)—1. Hindu Society and English Rule. 2. Torpedo Warfare. 3. Renaissance in Italy. 4. The Supernatural Element in Shakspeare. 5. Sir John Bowring. 6. Pre-Christian Dispensaries and Hospitals. 7. Russian Literature. 8. Cross-Fertilization of Plants, and Consanguineous Marriage.

We find in a book notice an interesting statement of the results of recent European investigations respecting idiocy and imbecility:

Of the causes of idiocy, that which stands out in the most terrible prominence is its hereditary reproduction. Of all mental derangements, it is that which is most frequently propagated by de-

scent. In about one half of the cases inherited neurotic tendency may be traced, sometimes showing itself as some other form of nerve disease. Idiocy may beget idiocy, as in the diabolical experiment recorded of some parish authorities, who, in order to get rid of the expense of maintaining a female idiot, hired a male idiot of a neighboring parish to marry her, by which the latter parish had to maintain the two, and also three idiot children which resulted from the union. The variation in the diseases resulting from hereditary taint, the manner in which generations and individuals may escape and yet transmit the tendency, is one of the strangest phenomena of heredity. Something more than the inherited taint is evidently necessary for the production of idiocy, and these exciting causes may produce it when no inherited taint exists. Dr. Ireland attributes considerable influence to profound mental emotions affecting the mother during pregnancy, and quotes evidence to show that the exciting and anxious male occupations into which women are now rushing and are being led, increase the proportion of idiots in their offspring, and may probably prove a widely effective cause of degeneracy of race. A careful survey of the evidence relating to marriages of consanguinity indisposes him to attribute much influence to it, except as intensifying hereditary taint. . . . It is one of the brighter lights on this dark subject to learn how much may be and has been done in the education of idiots. This country was long behind France and America in the attempt, but our institutions, thanks mainly to private benevolence, are now among the best. That the task is one of great difficulty it is hardly necessary to say. It must be both physical and mental, and succeeds far better as carried on in institutions than in private life. It should, if possible, begin early, but the period between the twelfth and fifteenth years is that in which most can be done. Cleanliness has first to be taught, and then the simple properties of objects. Speech may be taught to a large proportion, and many who cannot be taught to speak may be educated to express themselves in signs. The education of the senses has to proceed on a regular method. A few imbeciles can be taught to read, but the difficulties in the task, occasioned by the unsystematic character of English spelling, are great; and Dr. Ireland mentions an instance of an imbecile girl who had learned to read, saying to him, as if a bright idea had just struck her, "You sometimes can know to say a word from the way it is spelt."

## *Indian Reviews.*

INDIAN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1877. (Bombay.) 1. Theology of Christ. 2. The Native Christians of Salsette. 3. Sabbath Observance. 4. The Church and the Bible. 5. Sahet Mahet. 6. Principles of Spiritual Sowing.

The full title of this Review, which commences with the present number its fifth volume, is "The Indian Evangelical Re-

view; a Quarterly Journal of Missionary Thought and Effort." It is the first that we have received, and we are greatly pleased with its examination. Its pages exhibit a rare ability, and a richly evangelical and catholic spirit. The leading article, a review of Dr. J. P. Thompson's volume with the same title, exhibits a breadth of thought and scholarship that might both satisfy and grace the proudest Review of any land. The second article is an account of a body of Christians in the neighborhood of Bombay, descendants of the converts of Xavier. The fifth article is devoted to the ruins of Sahet Mahet, the ancient Sravasti, the metropolis of Buddhism, in North India, and, in the belief that rich archæological treasures may be exhumed, pleads for complete explorations under Government auspices. In the sixth, a paper full of missionary fire, is a paragraph that we do well to heed:—

> In no country, probably, so much as in India, and among no people so much as the Hindus, does the danger exist of building up within the Church wood, hay, stubble, and other perishable materials, which will be utterly consumed when the Lord's fire comes to try every missionary's work. The danger is all the greater when the home Churches, impatient from lack of faith, or boastful each of its own doings, cry out for converts, and the missionary is tempted to gather any semblance of fruit, without conscientiously inquiring whether it will satisfy the heavenly Master, who will admit no chaff into his garner.—Page 89.

The department of "Notes and Intelligence" occupies thirty-four of the one hundred and twenty-five pages of the number, with missionary information and discussion. One topic, not a little debated in recent years, is thus treated:—

> There is in certain quarters a prejudice against "missionary education," arising from the opinion that education is not a missionary's business; we ought instead, we are told, to be preaching. Our inquiry is, Is not this prejudice, like so many other prejudices, unreasonable? In America and England many Christian men are engaged in the work of educating the young. Some of the choicest Christian spirits that can be found in all Christendom are occupied day after day in giving instruction in the classics, in mathematics, in science, and in philosophy, to numbers of young men who seek instruction from the same motives which actuate Indian pupils—the desire to get a living. Are not their labors wasted? Is it advisable for Christian men —some of them clergymen at that—to spend the best part of

their lives in the drudgery of the class-room, instead of being out in the highways and hedges preaching? The schools in which they teach have in many cases been established by the same class of devoted men, who are well-known contributors to the funds of missionary societies. Have they not put their money to a wrong, because to an inferior, purpose? Would not all the money which has been devoted to the establishment of Christian schools and colleges be better applied if given to the Bible Society? Are not the heathen perishing? Now, nobody hesitates about the proper answers to be made to such questions. Well, then, we ask, is it not just as necessary that the young men of India should have Christian instruction, in order to prepare them properly for the duties of life, as it is for young men in Scotland or Massachusetts? Is there any good reason why a pious professor is *in* his place when conducting a class of American youth through Homer, or expounding the principle of the spectrum analysis in a Scotch university, and *out* of his place when doing precisely the same sort of work in an Indian school? Is there not, in short, much more need that young men in India should have good Christian instruction, simply because the Government furnishes nothing of the sort, and because their other surroundings are so unfavorable to the development of a really noble manhood? Some good people, and some directors of missionary societies, too, we are sorry to say, think that there is only one way in which a man can do good—and that is by preaching. It reminds us of a good but very ignorant old lady, who felt sure that it was her duty to get up in the pulpit and preach, on the ground that it was commanded that the Gospel should be preached to every creature. "Sure enough," said her wise pastor, "but it was not commanded to every creature to preach the Gospel."

If any thing were needed to correct such a wrong idea as we have just referred to, it might be found in the confessions of intelligent natives themselves. The "Indian Christian Herald" and the "Indian Mirror" have both reproduced from the columns of the "Sadharani," a vernacular paper of Calcutta, the following significant paragraph: "With us in Bengal parents and others have not the least interest in the religious training of boys and girls; teachers see not to the religious education of young men; leaders of society have no heart, no interest, consequently no influence, in keeping members of society from evil, and a foreign Government has no hand in the moral character of the great body of its subjects. The result is that, now-a-days, whoever manages to steer clear in life of section 500 of the Penal Code is reckoned virtuous. He whose house has never been searched by the police passes for a gentleman, and the great man who treats people to a garden feast every Saturday is belauded as a saint. Is there a society more degraded than this?"

When such things are publicly stated by Hindus themselves it becomes the opponents of missionary education—for such, we

grieve to say, there are—to bethink themselves if their opposition be not mistimed and misplaced. And it becomes the friends of missionary education to bestir themselves more vigorously than ever.—Pp. 118, 119.

## *German Reviews.*

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Riehm and Dr. Köstlin. First Number, 1878. *Essays:* 1. KLEINERT, Amos Comenius. 2. KAWERAU, The Solemnization of Marriages. 3. KATTENBUSCH, Critical Studies on Symbolics. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. KÖSTLIN, A Contribution to the Eschatology of the Reformers. 2. KOLBE, Exegesis of Ephes. ii, 19-22. *Reviews:* BUDDE, Critical Remarks on Job; reviewed by SMEND.

This number introduces the second half century of the celebrated German Quarterly, and the editors therefore take occasion to give a brief history of its career. It was founded by two professors of theology at the University of Heidelberg—C. Ullmann and F. W. C. Umbreit—with the active co-operation of the publisher, Fr. Perthes. All the three founders occupy an honorable place in the history of German literature. Both Ullmann and Umbreit were prolific theological writers, the former being best known by his work on the Reformers before the Reformation; the latter by his work on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Nearly all of Ullmann's works have appeared in English translations. As regular contributors were mentioned on the title page, Gieseler, Lücke, and Nitzsch, all of whom rank among the most distinguished German theologians of the nineteenth century. Gieseler is the author of a manual of Church history in five volumes, which has been translated into English by the late Professor H. B. Smith, of this city. To Lücke we are indebted for one of the best commentaries of the Epistle to the Romans. Nitzsch has immortalized himself by his great works on the "System of Christian Doctrine," and "Practical Theology." When Gieseler and Lücke died (1855 and 1856) their places were filled by E. Rothe, the author of the great work on "Christian Ethics," and Julius Müller, the author of the great work on "Sin." After the death of Umbreit (1860) Rothe became temporarily one of the editors, and in his place Hundeshagen, one of the contributors. After the expiration of Rothe (at the close of 1864) Ullmann transferred the management of the Quarterly to Hundeshagen and E. Riehm, and Beyschlag became one of the regular contributors. The two

first numbers of 1865 were still edited under the superintendence of Ullmann, who died January 12, 1865. After the death of Nitzsch (1868) Köstlin succeeded him as regular contributor. When Hundeshagen died (1872) Köstlin became one of the editors, and the trias of regular contributors was completed by G. Baur. With the exception of the latter, who is professor at the University of Leipsic, the entire editorial corps is connected with the University of Halle. The *Studien und Kritiken* was intended to be the organ of the new school of German theology, which was founded by Schleiermacher, and which aimed at reconciling the freedom of religious and philosophical speculation with the belief in the Christian revelation and the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. Few periodicals have ever had a more brilliant array of contributors, and have contained a more valuable collection of original essays. The fifty volumes of the *Studien* are alone a vast store-house of theological learning and deserve a place in the library of at least every theological seminary of the Protestant world. Its use is greatly facilitated by general indexes, which have appeared every tenth year. A classified index of all the essays of the fifty volumes is announced as soon forthcoming.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Fourth Number, 1877.—1. A. SCHWEIZER, The Future of Religion. 2. HILGENFELD, Peter in Rome and John in Asia Minor. 3. OTTO, Have Barnabas, Justin, and Irenæus made use of the Second Epistle to Peter? 4. GÖRRES, Was Aurelianus a Persecutor of the Christians when he was still a Governor? 5. HOLTZMANN, Lucas and Josephus. 6. HILGENFELD, The Epistles of Clemens Romanus and their Syriac Translation. 7. Reviews of ZIEGLER, Fragments of an ante-Hieronymian Translation of the Epistles of Peter; of Commodrani Carmina, edited by LUDWIG; of LANDAU, System of Ethics; of PHILLIPS, The Doctrine of Addai.

First Number, 1878.—1. WILKEN, Critical Review of the Relation which exists between Philosophy and Theology according to Kant. 2. BAUR, On Lipsius's Manual of Evangelical Protestant Dogmatics. 3. HILGENFELD, The Muratorian Fragment and its late edition by Jakobus Schuurmans Steckhoven. 4. GÖRRES, Contribution to a History of the Early Church. 5. KOHLER, The Controversy between Rabanus and Gottschalk. 6. HILGENFELD, The Epistle of James and I. Chr. K. von Hofman. 7. Reviews of WEISS, The Gospel of Matthew and its Lucas Parallels; of Hermæ Pastor, edited by GEBHARDT and HARNACK; of SCHUM, The Acts of Paul and Thecla; of WEINGARTEN, The Origin of Monasticism in the Post-Constantine era; of Barnabæ Epistola, edited by HILGENFELD.

The essay, by Professor Weingarten, on the Origin of Monasticism, which ushered in the new quarterly "Journal for Church History," (see Methodist Quarterly Review, April, 1876,) has been published in book form, and has made quite a stir in the theological world. The work has been generally recognized as

the best that has thus far been written on the subject, and no one will hereafter be able to write on the history of Monasticism without taking notice of the result of this work. Many of the traditional views concerning the origin of Monasticism appear, in the light which is cast upon them by the argumentation of Weingarten, so untenable that they are likely to disappear forever from manuals of Church history. As might be expected from a work propounding entirely new views, there are some points in it on which other scholars who have investigated the same subject differ. Thus Hilgenfeld, in a lengthy review of the work in the first number of the Journal for Scientific Theology, while thanking the author for the light which he has shed on an obscure subject, takes occasion to develop a theory different from Weingarten concerning the real origin of Monasticism. Weingarten had undertaken to trace the beginning of monasteries in Egypt to an influence of the pagan religion, especially to the temples of Serapis, but had rejected any historical connection between the origin of Christian monasteries and Indian Buddhism on the ground that there are no proofs extant of any popular connection of the Egyptian people with the religious ideas of Buddhism, and though Persian and Indian navigators had come to Eastern and Central Egypt, the religious emissaries of Buddhism did certainly not advance westward beyond Cabool, Tabristan, and Koordistan. Hilgenfeld disputes this exclusion of Buddhistic influence upon the origin of Christian monasticism, and undertakes to prove that, on the contrary, there are strong indications of assuming such an influence. He refers to the work of Chwolsohn on the Sabians, who says that an influence of Buddhism upon the Gnosticism of Asia Minor may have taken place, as En-Nedim expressly mentions that Buddhism had entered Transoxiana even before Manes. Professor Weber, the great Sanscrit scholar, finds it highly probable that Buddhist missionaries, impelled by religious enthusiasm, scattered through the wide territories of Western Eran at the time of the Greek rule. If it is further taken into consideration that the road of the world's commerce is also the road of religious missions, Professor Hilgenfeld regards it as a natural inference that Buddhist missionaries may have advanced as far as Egypt. Indeed, a Buddhist writer, who is quoted in Köppen's work on

the Religion of Buddha, (Berlin, 1857,) states that one century after the third ecumenical council of Buddhism, (247 B. C.,) "Buddhism was flourishing at Alexandria, the capital of the Javana country." In a former article in the Journal for Scientific Theology, (1867, I,) Professor Hilgenfeld had tried to prove that the Alexandria referred to by the Buddhist writer, as the capital of the Javana country or Greece, was not the remote Alexandria ad Canoasum, but Alexandria in Egypt. Hilgenfeld furthermore refers to the historical fact that Buddhism was the first religion which introduced Monasticism and united the ascetics for common life. He believes that a direct influence of Buddhism upon the Essenes of Palestine may safely be assumed, for the four divisions of Essene ascetics—the abstinence from anointment, meat, wine, and marriage, the abolition of serfage, and the rejection of bloody sacrifices—all point to Buddhism. An influence of Buddhism upon the Therapeutæ of Egypt is still more probable. These Therapeutæ, according to Mangold, (*De monachatus originibus et causis*, Marburg, 1852,) maintained themselves for a long time, and became at the end of the third century Christian monks. The Essenes, according to Gieseler, appear to have maintained themselves until the fifth century. An influence of Buddhism, through the Jewish Therapeutæ of Egypt and the Essenes of Palestine in the first development of Christian Monasticism is, therefore, regarded by Hilgenfeld as a supposition by no means hazardous.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by BRIEGER. Vol. II. Second number—*Researches and Essays:* 1. NOSGEN, The Ecclesiastical Stand-point of Hegesippus. 2. MEILHORN, The Doctrine of Human Freedom according to Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν. 3. GASS, The Origin of Monasticism. 4. HERTZBERG, A Few Remarks on the Preservation of Greek Nationality by the Greek Church. *Analecta:* 1. ZAHN, The Greek Irenæus and the whole Hegesippus in the Sixteenth Century. 2. HARNACK, Remarks on Eusebius' Church History, vol. iv, 15, 37. 3. WALTZ, Preliminary Statement on Two Valuable Manuscripts at Riga. 4. WALTZ, Epistolae Reformatorum, vol. ii. 5. MEYER, Correspondence between Melanchthon and Margrave John of Brandenburg.

In the notice given above of another German periodical, The Journal for Scientific Theology, we have taken occasion to refer to the interesting discussions concerning the origin of monasticism which have been called forth in Germany by the appearance of the remarkable work of Professor Weingarten. The Journal for Church History, in its present number, contains a contribution to the controversy from the pen of Pro-

fessor Gass, one of the assistant editors of this periodical, and well known by a number of excellent theological writings. He also bestows the highest praise upon the keenness of the investigations of Professor Weingarten. He believes that hereafter few will be found willing to contend for Paul of Thebes, heretofore celebrated as the first Christian eremite, but whose very existence is emphatically denied by Weingarten. He recognizes the arguments which Weingarten has adduced against the authenticity of the Vita Antonii as a work of Athanasius, as very momentous, though he calls for a new investigation of the literary relation of this work to the genuine works of Athanasius. Many of the assertions of Weingarten are, however, regarded as going too far, and not resting on a sufficiently firm basis. Gass believes, in particular, that an important institution like monasticism, which, though proceeding from a local contact with a foreign worship, had yet met with so rapid diffusion, and had been incorporated into the organism of the Church, and taken root in the theological views of the most prominent contemporaries with such success, that even its excrescences and faults were spared, would be an anomalous phenomenon, if the situation of the Church society at its transition into the broad life of the world had not met it half way. The article of Professor Gass is chiefly devoted to showing the germs of monastic views in the Church of that period.

The remarks of Professor Zahn on Eusebius and Hegesippus refer to a Greek manuscript of the sixteenth century, which, in the opinion of the writer, proves the existence at that time of the Greek original of the work of Irenæus against the Gnostics, which is now extant only in a Latin translation, as well as of the entire work of Hegesippus. Professor Zahn thinks that the important rediscoveries of hidden literary treasures, and especially the complete restoration of the Epistles of Clement of Rome, have revived and strengthened the hope that, in the place of meager fragments and unreliable translations in which at present a large portion of the earliest literature of the Church is preserved, the whole of the original works may yet be recovered.

## ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### OLD CATHOLICS.

OUR reviews of the Old Catholic movement have rarely had occasion to refer to France. This country, in which the defenders of the Gallican liberties have for so many centuries been the leaders of the opposition within the Catholic Church to the ultra-papal theories, has sorely disappointed the hopes of those who thought that it would again take a prominent part in the revolt of Catholic scholars against the new corruption of the Church of the Vatican Council. Only a few men of distinction, of whom Father Hyacinthe and Abbé Michaud are best known, have remained steadfast in their adhesion to the Old Catholic cause. Many others who were outspoken opponents of papal infallibility before its promulgation as a dogma, like Father Gratry, ended a long vacillation by final submission. Count Montalembert, the most famous among the lay champions of Roman Catholic interests in France, died without letting the world know whether in case of a longer life he would have submitted to the Vatican decrees, or joined the Old Catholic opposition against them. A considerable number of priests were known to sympathize with them, and about thirty of them found pastoral charges in the French-speaking districts of Switzerland. But in France itself no Old Catholic congregations have been organized. The ultramontane Government has made the utmost efforts to obstruct and prevent the consolidation of the reform movement, and the leaders of the opponents to ultramontanism were either too indifferent in religious matters, or too hostile to religion of any kind, to take the slightest interest in a religious question. Thus France has remained without any Old Catholic congregations and societies, and it has even been without any periodical having the special aim of diffusing information on the progress of the movement in other countries.

The want of an Old Catholic periodical has recently been supplied by the establishment at Paris of an Old Catholic Review, entitled, *La Réforme Catholique*. It is for the present to be published twice a month, and M. Leon Séché signs his name as "Directeur-Géraat." In the three numbers which have reached us we find articles by L. Séché, J. Wallon, Dr. Déramey, W. Jeoffroy, and others. The two latter are priests in the French districts of Switzerland, and Déramey is also a doctor of the Sorbonne. Séché and Wallon are French authors who devote themselves to a defense of the Old Catholic interests in the province of literature. Séché has published several volumes of poems, entitled, *Le Dies Iræ du Mexique*, *Les Griffes du Lion*, *Amour et Patrie*, and has announced as soon forthcoming three religious works, entitled, *L'Ancienne Eglise de France*, *Le Role du Clergé, Régulier dans l'Etat*, *La Separation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat*. From Wallon we have works on *La Cour de Rome et la France* and *La Verité sur le Concile*. The first number is introduced by a declaration of principles by the editors. They claim to be "men of faith

and of reason, retaining as articles of faith the decisions of the general councils adopted by both the Eastern and Western Churches." They also recognize the decisions of the Union Conference of Bonn, to which all the Old Catholic Churches have given their adhesion. As men of faith they "reject the doctrines and practices of ultramontanism which are called Roman, but which are not Christian; doctrines which have given birth to the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, the consequences of which have been to place the Virgin above Christ, and the Pope above the Church." They also proclaim "their invincible attachment to the Latin Church of the West," the primitive traditions of which have been destroyed by the ultramontanes. They consider the Syllabus "as a law of reaction and of hatred invented by men to whom the Gospel is something obsolete, and to whom the word of the Papal court replaces the word of Jesus Christ." They say they are neither reformers nor sectarians, but that they belong to the great family of Catholics, who have not ceased to labor for reform within the Church without ever breaking with her. The appearance of an organ of the Old Catholic movement in France is of special importance at a time when the general elections held in France have unmistakably shown that the overwhelming majority of all the voters in France refuse an absolute obedience to the behests of Rome. The bishops had been unanimous in denouncing the Republican party to the country; they had ordered public prayer for the success of the Monarchists and of the Government, and even granted indulgences to those who would vote their ticket. That this ticket has, nevertheless, been rejected by so large a majority, may, therefore, be considered an auspicious omen for the future of the religious reform movement. If only France had among its political men as many men as Germany whom strong religious convictions impel to the opposition against Romanism, great results might follow a success of the Republican party in the political crisis of the country. Unfortunately this is not the case. The leaders of the Republican opposition in France, Thiers and Gambetta, have not shown a just appreciation of the importance of a religious opposition to the ultramontane party; and among all the members of the Republican majority in the French Chamber of Deputies there is probably not a single one who has openly identified himself with the Old Catholic cause. The fact, however, that the success of the Republicans imperatively demands the full recognition of the principle of religious liberty will compel the Republicans to include the legal protection of the Old Catholics as a part of their political programme.

The Old Catholic Church of Germany has fully completed its organization, and takes its place among the religious denominations of Germany. It proceeds with great caution in the revision and reformation of its doctrinal and liturgical standards. The fourth synod of the Church, which was held in Bonn, again performed a large amount of important business. The Synodal Council presented a draft of a service of general confession, intended for congregational use as a preparation

for holy communion. This service, though not proposed as a substitute for private confession, which is left to each man's conscience, is expected to largely supersede it. The service is in the form of a Litany, short, and generally in the words of Scripture. The following passage shows the Old Catholic idea of confession, as opposed to the compulsory auricular confession of the Papal Church: "I confess before God the Almighty and all his dear saints, before thee, O priest of the Lord, and before you my brethren." The Synod accepted the service, and authorized the congregations to introduce it. The troublesome question of the abolition of priestly celibacy was revived by motions of various character, and the Synod resolved, by a large majority, that the council should ascertain what, if any, legal hinderances stood in the way of the abolition of compulsory celibacy, and should report on this and on the various motions presented to the next Synod. The vexed question is evidently approaching a solution. The most important matter before the Synod was the revision of the missal and the introduction of the national language. In regard to the latter point, the congregations were permitted to use certain portions of the mass service in a German translation with the consent of the Synodal Council, and it is expected that this permission will be almost universally accepted. In regard to the reform of the mass service itself, they attack first the so-called "application" of mass for various people or societies. They repudiate the Roman Catholic formulary, "This holy sacrifice is offered for," etc., because it favors the opinion that every celebration of the mass is an especial, independent sacrifice, and that the priest can really dispose of its operative virtue. According to the statistical report of the Council of the Synod, the numbers of ascertained, inscribed adherents of the cause in Germany reach 53,640, as against 49,908 last year—an increase of 3,732. This increase is constant throughout. The largest gain is, as usual, in Baden, but also Bavaria produces 770 more members. The numbers are thus divided: Prussia, 35 congregations and 21,797 souls; Baden, 44 congregations and 18,866 souls; Bavaria, 34 congregations and 11,338 souls; Hesse, 5 congregations and 1,155 souls; Oldenburg, 247 souls; and Wurtemberg, 237 souls. The roll contains the names of 52 priests, of whom 55 are actively engaged in parochial work; since the last Synod there have been five accessions, (two newly ordained,) and as many have departed. In Prussia 25 priests are at work, in Baden 18, in Bavaria 12, etc. The sixth Congress of the German Old Catholics was held in September in the city of Mentz, which is well known as one of the strongholds of the ultramontane party in Germany. The president of all the former Congresses, Dr. von Schutte, was absent on account of ill health, and in his place Mr. Schwartzmann, the president of one of the high State courts of the Grand Duchy of Baden, was elected president. It had been very wisely arranged that no reference should be made to the controversies which divide the members of the new Church, and, accordingly, the two most difficult of these controversies, the proposed abolition of priestly celibacy and the liturgical question, were barely mentioned. Both parties, the

conservative and the reformatory, appeared to be desirous to leave the decision to the proper Church authority—the Synod. The most important among the resolutions adopted by the Congress refer to the new efforts made by Rome to obtain a controlling influence upon the State schools. The Congress denounced these efforts as injurious to the best interests of both the school and the State, but at the same time expressed a decided opinion that religion should continue to be an obligatory part of public instruction. Other resolutions recommend an active interest in the wider circulation of the Old Catholic papers, especially the *Deutscher Mercur* and the *Altkatholische Bole*, the support of sick clergymen and of the students of Old Catholic theology. Like its predecessors, the Congress received letters expressive of cordial sympathy from representative men of other religious denominations, in particular from bishops of the Old Catholic Churches of Switzerland and the Netherlands and of the Church of England.

In Switzerland the Christian Catholic Church held its third Synod in Berne, in May. The attendance of the Synod was more numerous than that of the German Synod, fifty-one priests and eighty-nine lay delegates being present. The utmost harmony prevailed between the delegates of German and of French Switzerland. The ritual proposed by the liturgic commission was adopted provisionally for one year. The German Catechism of Salfmann, revised by Bishop Herzog, was recommended to the parishes. The revision of the missal and the re-establishment of the communion in both kinds was also discussed, but the Synod voted to defer action until its next meeting. The Synodal Council consists of three priests and five laymen; among its members are Professor Michaud, the bishop's vicar-general; Pfarrer Schröter, of Rheinfelden, the rival candidate for the episcopate; Pfarrer Hassler, of Olten, a distinguished writer; Mr. Keller, of Aaran, and Mr. Vigier, of Solothurn, both of whom have been landammann, or president, of their respective Cantons. According to the last statistical report, the Church of Switzerland has 55 congregations, 17 associations, 66 priests, and 73,380 members.

In Austria the Government persists in subjecting the Old Catholics to annoying laws, and has thereby succeeded in repressing the movement. In 1876 the Old Catholics had only three parishes and three priests, with about 35,000 souls; but how extensive the sympathy of the educated classes with the Old Catholics is, may be seen from the fact that the majority of the House of Deputies has never ceased to demand from the Government the recognition of the Old Catholics as an ecclesiastical organization. In June, 1877, an interpellation, signed by twenty-nine deputies, was addressed to the Minister of Public Worship, which recites some remarkable facts from the history of the struggle of the Austrian Old Catholics for legal existence. It recalled the fact that a considerable time ago the House of Deputies adopted a bill for regulating the relations of the Old Catholics. The House of Lords did not concur in this resolution, but the committee of the House declared its belief that the Government should expressly recognize the validity of the marriages and

the legitimacy of the children of the Old Catholics. The committee thought that the existing law of Austria fully guaranteed the rights claimed by the Old Catholics, and even the representative of the Austrian Government indicated that the Government would not dispute the right of the Old Catholic priests to solemnize marriage, if they complied with the provisions of the law. The Old Catholics then applied to the Government for permission to organize congregations; but, after waiting about a whole year for an answer, they were informed of a large number of preliminary conditions which they would have to comply with before they could expect a recognition. All these conditions were accepted by the Old Catholics, and accordingly in March, 1877, they once more applied to the Government to keep its promise and to recognize them. No answer being received, the twenty new deputies asked the Government how it could explain the long delay, and whether it was now resolved to recognize the Old Catholics as an independent religious organization.

In Italy the Old Catholic movement has numerous advocates. It has warm friends in the Italian Parliament, and even in the State ministry. At the close of the year 1876 Luigi Prota-Giurleo was elected bishop by a general election, at which over 10,000 votes were cast. The full separation of the friends of the cause from the Papal Church, and the organization of independent Old Catholic congregations, has, however, not yet taken place. It is a good omen for the future success of the Old Catholic Church that the opposition against the Vatican Council and against the temporal power of the Pope has, among the educated classes, and even among the lower clergy, more numerous adherents in Italy than in any other country. The most notable among many proofs of this fact is the recent dismissal from the Order of the Jesuits of Father Curci, one of the oldest and most learned members of the Order, and for a long time an editor of the foremost of all ultramontane organs, the *Civeitta Cattolica*. Few men in Italy have done so much as Curci for the defense of the interests of the Roman Catholic Church, but he has recently fallen out with his party by advocating a recognition of the kingdom of Italy and an acquiescence in the abolition of the temporal power. In June, 1875, Curci wrote a long letter on the subject to the Pope himself, which in March, 1877, appeared in the *Revisto Europea*, and created an immense excitement. Curci was ordered to retract his sentiments, and, when he refused, was forced to ask for his dismissal from the Order to which he had belonged for fifty-two years, in order to escape expulsion. It is reported that the agitation among the clergy throughout Italy, in Rome itself, and even in the Jesuit ranks, on the expediency of a compromise, and a reconciliation of the Church with the State in Italy by an acceptance of accomplished facts and a renunciation of the Pope's claims to a temporal sovereignty, is gaining ground with a rapidity which causes no little disquietude at the Vatican court. Among the men won over to the views of conciliation advocated in Curci's writings is said to be Cardinal di Pietro.

## ART. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

DR. E. SPIESS, of the University of Jena, has published a history of the development of the views concerning the condition of man after death. (*Entwicklungsgeschichte der Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode.*) The work is divided into three divisions. At first he treats, in five chapters, of the subjects which constitute the basis for the belief in a future life, namely, the views concerning the substance and origin, as well as the destiny and the fate, of souls, (chap. i, ii,) the history of death, (iii,) funeral rites and graves, (iv,) and the arguments for the belief in a future life, (v.) A second division, in twelve chapters, reviews the eschatological ideas of (i) the barbarous nations, (ii) the Egyptians, (iii) the Chinese, (iv) the Indians, (v) the Persians, (vi) the Greeks, (vii) the Romans, (viii) the Celts, (ix) the Germans, (x) the Slavs, (xi) the Jews, (xii) the Islam. Lastly, the author gives the results of his comparison of different religions. He shows that, in some form or other, the belief in an existence of man after death is a belief common to the human race, and that without it a noble conception of human life is not possible. The great learning of the author is generally recognized in the German reviews of this book.

An important work in favor of the separation between Church and State has been published by Professor Maassen, of the University of Graz, in Austria. (*Neun Capitel über Freie Kirche und Gewissensfreiheit.*) The author of this work has repeatedly changed his religious opinion. By birth a Protestant, he first became known as a writer of ultraconservative views. He then, like several other representative men of that party, became a Roman Catholic, and received an appointment at an Austrian university. At the beginning of the Old Catholic movement he was in full sympathy with the opposition to Papal Infallibility, but subsequently found fault with the further development of the Old Catholic movement, especially with its support by the State Governments in Germany and Switzerland. He still regards himself, like the Old Catholics, as a member of the Catholic Church, but continues in his opposition to the Vatican Council and its decrees. A large portion of the work is devoted to a development of the views of the author concerning the true relation between Church and State, and it may be inferred from what has been said before, that on the one hand he finds in the past history of this relation much to blame and little to praise, and that, on the other hand, his own views are not palatable to any of the large religious parties in Germany. The great scholarship of the author is, however, generally recognized, and his work is regarded as a most valuable contribution to the literature on the relation between Church and State. The study of the historical relations between these two great powers is now pursued in Europe with renewed eagerness. A very able work on the history of this relation in Switzerland has been begun by Professor Gareis, formerly of

the University of Berne, (now of Giessen,) and Professor Zorn, of Zurich. (*Staat und Kirche in der Schweiz.* Zurich, 1877.) The first volume has recently been issued, and the remainder will soon follow.

The most important work which has yet been published on the Vatican Council is undoubtedly the work of Professor Fiedrich, of the University of Munich. (*Geschichte des Vaticanischen Koncils.* Bonn, 1877.) The author attended the Council as the "theologian" of one of the German prelates, was one of the most determined opponents of the proposed doctrine of Papal Infallibility, and, remaining firm in this opposition after the promulgation of the doctrine, became one of the leaders of the Old Catholic movement. He had previously gained by a number of works, especially by his "Church History of Germany," the reputation of one of the best Catholic historians of the present time. The first volume of the work, which has recently been published, contains the history of the Roman Catholic Church during the nineteenth century, which is treated of so fully because without it, as the author says, it is impossible to obtain a correct view of the work of the Vatican Council. The first volume is divided into four books. In the first two the author briefly traces the origin of the papal system and its development until the end of the eighteenth century, the preparation of the Council by founding an ultramontane party in France, Germany, and Switzerland in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the third book he speaks of the special measures adopted during the pontificate of Pius for preparing the Catholic world for the Council, and in the fourth book he treats of the "Introduction of the Council." The second volume will be devoted to the history of the Council.

## FRANCE.

The "French Cyclopedia of Religious Science," by Lichtenberger, (*Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses.* New York: F. W. Christern,) is rapidly progressing. The second volume, which has recently been completed, contains the articles from "Baader" to "Censure." The high literary character which distinguished the first volume is fully sustained in the second, and we feel no hesitation in repeating the opinion expressed in a former number of the Methodist Quarterly Review, that this Cyclopedia may be regarded as the most important work which has yet been produced by Protestant France. A remarkable feature in this Cyclopedia is the co-operation of all the theological parties found among the Protestants of France. In the *Comité Directeur*, Viguié, Colani, Réville, and Maurice Verne represent all shades of liberalism; Bois, Bonifas, J. Monod, Dhombres, Decoffet, Bersier, Stapfer, Recolin, Sayous, the evangelical party of the Reformed Church; Matter, Philip and Samuel Berger, the Lutheran Church; Pressensé, Lelièvre, and Hollard, the Free Churches. The list of contributors contains several scholars who are not Protestants, among them the Orientalist Oppert, who has contributed the article "Babylone." On French subjects, the second volume again contains a large amount of interesting information which one would look for in vain in the Cyclopedias of other languages.

## ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Three vols., 8vo. Vol. I, The History of the Creeds, pp. 941. Vol. II, pp. 557. Vol. III, pp. 880. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

These three noble octavos fill a vacant space with a most valuable occupant. They are a rich present to our English and American theologians. Winer's "Confessions of Christendom," translated by Pope, is a masterpiece of concise comparative Christian theology, and from its lesser price is more available for the ordinary Christian scholar; but no presentation of the creeds of our holy Christianity in our English language is at all comparable with this. It is the second and third of the three volumes that contain the creeds, these being preceded by a historical and theological survey in the first volume. The second volume contains the Greek and Roman creeds. First we have the brief confessions found in the Bible, especially in the New Testament, together with many passages in the New Testament that seem to refer to confessional forms used in the Apostolic Church, some of them baptismal. Next follow the ANTENICENE confessions found in the early post-Apostolic fathers, as Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 107; Irenæus, 180; Tertullian, 200. The *formulæ* furnished by these three writers are plainly the originals of the Apostles' Creed, so that essentially that creed is unquestionably an apostolic document. These *formulæ* are traced through the leading fathers of the first three or four centuries, and Dr. Schaff furnishes a very interesting comparative table of their contents. To the student of the earliest Christian antiquity this will appear an invaluable chapter. Then follow the five ECUMENICAL CREEDS, accepted alike by Greek, Roman, and Protestant Churches, a rejection of which by any Protestants Dr. Schaff pronounces to be "heretical Protestantism." These, with the exception of the Athanasian, are all Greek creeds. The five ROMAN CREEDS, beginning with that of Trent, come next. Then we have the three GREEK AND RUSSIAN CREEDS. The OLD CATHOLIC manifestoes close this volume. The third volume is made up of the great body of Protestant creeds. First are the Lutheran symbols, second the Reformed, and third the modern Protestant. The Lutheran, in whose framing Melanchthon had an important share, differs not widely in its soteriology from our Wesleyan-Arminianism, while the so-called Re-

formed are more or less stringently Calvinistic. Professedly the Reformers went back to the Bible for their doctrines, but, unfortunately, it was to the Bible with its rays refracted through the intervening Augustine. The Greek Church, on the other hand, in whose language both the New Testament and the most primitive post-apostolic documents were written, is what we call Arminian.

Dr. Schaff's own Introduction, embracing the entire first volume, is, of course, done with great scholarship and ability. Besides a vast amount of pure and valuable history, he furnishes with entire freedom a great variety of individual opinions of his own, with some of which we should venture to differ. The entire work possesses great value for the entire Christian Church, and will long stand as a monument to the honor of its author.

A general survey of the Creeds suggests some reflections. First, at a glance, in chronological order they may be with measurable accuracy classified as Greek, Latin, and Teutonic. The first Christian Church was not Roman. The Romanistic claim to primal antiquity is falsified upon the very face of the records. Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, and Corinth are all anterior to Rome. The New Testament is not Roman but Greek. And all the truly Ecumenical Creeds (under which head we scarcely reckon the pseudo-Athanasian) are Greek. It is not until the fifteenth century that an originally and purely Romish Creed appears. It may, without much qualification, be said that this succession of Creeds marks the real ethnographic march of Christianity.

Second. There is a remarkable doctrinal succession. The early Creeds, at the early Christian centuries, were largely occupied with Christology. The personality of Christ is the central point of discussion, and the relations of all other matters to him are the surrounding topics. A trinality, though not the well-defined Trinity, appears in the Apostles' Creed. A Socinian can repeat that Creed without much violence to its words. But Christ, as Son of God, founder of the Church, and judge of quick and dead, is the main topic of doctrine.

Third. It is not until the sixteenth century that in the Tridentine Creed, framed by Rome in self-defense against Protestantism, that Rome shapes a doctrine of atonement, and semi-predestination into an authoritative formula. A short time previous the Lutheran, or rather Melanchthonian, theology had done a similar thing. The doctrine of predestination in the first three Christian centuries was a heresy. It was the dogma of the Gnostics. The

early Church repelled it, used against it the same arguments as our modern Arminians, and excommunicated it as hostile to the very fundamentals of Christianity. It was not until the so-called Reformed Church framed its Creeds that, under the influence of the lurid genius of John Calvin, unqualified predestination obtruded itself into a public Christian Creed. This heresy was imperiously enthroned as orthodoxy. Old Gnosticism became new Christianity. The so-called Reformed Churches took Augustinianism, aggravated its worst points, and exalted them into a test of true faith. On these points the Creed of Trent is better than the new Creeds. This was the doctrinal deformation of the Reformation. A period of dead pseudo-orthodoxy naturally followed. The Reformation needed to be reformed, and that work was performed by James Arminius doctrinally, and by John Wesley spiritually. And this, the union of the truth and the life, was *the completion of the Reformation.* How slowly works the power of truth! "God is patient, because God is eternal."

---

*That Review Article.* By Rev. GEO. D. WATSON, D.D. Published by National Publication Association for the Promotion of Holiness. 24mo., pp. 33. Philadelphia.

The "That Review Article" of this pamphlet is Dr. J. O. A. Clark's article, published in a late number of our Quarterly, and the pamphlet itself is a fierce and fiery onslaught and part of a volley all along the line upon the article and the Quarterly. The article is held to be heretical, and the Quarterly is solemnly denounced as untrue to Methodism, and its editor as attempting to overthrow the true doctrine of sanctification.

The article of Dr. Clark we do not hold to be exactly Wesleyan. At any rate it can be held as only *generically* Wesleyan, and on a *specific* point or two anti-Wesleyan. It is Wesleyan in that it holds up a Christian perfection as a definite object of aspiration and efforts, and does not, with Calvinism, hold that all progress consists in a deepening consciousness of sin. But Dr. Clark distinguishes between sanctification and perfection. Sanctification (he does not say entire sanctification, but a sanctification complete as measured by the then capacity of the man) he places at justification; while perfection, as *absolute*, belongs to God, yet as *relative* belongs to man, and consists in making due progress by experience and faith toward the absolute. So far in point of its doctrinal facts Dr. Clark appears to be Wesleyan; but there are two points on which he seems to diverge—one a point of doctrinal

fact, and the other a point of terms. The *first* is that he denies that definite experience sometimes called the "second blessing;" the second is that, while Wesley uses the term *perfection* to designate the definite state attained by the "second blessing," Dr. Clark applies it to that due progress toward the blessed absolute which constitutes a heathful and vigorous piety. In the fact of that progression Wesley is as decided as Dr. C.; for Wesley does not make the "second blessing" a stopping point. It is a stage which admits an eternal progress beyond. So far, then, as doctrinal points are concerned, the negation of the definite second process, analogous to our first conversion, is Dr. Clark's only divergency. He would, we suppose, admit that there is a "second blessing," but deny its equalizing co-ordination with our first justification; and he would admit a *second* only as he would a *third*, a *fourth*, up to a *thousandth* and more; it being the Christian's privilege to go on from blessing to blessing, and from strength to strength, until he mounts into glory. And so, perhaps, he would say, with one of the holiest ministers of our acquaintance, "I have been entirely sanctified forty times."

We did not and do not understand Dr. Clark as affirming that what we mean as entire sanctification takes place at justification. He does, indeed, maintain that a complete sanctification takes place at justification, as measured by the *then* capacity of the man; but not an "entire sanctification" as measured by his matured capacity. This distinction enables us to answer the question, Why is the man not *entirely sanctified* at justification? The distinction is, we take it, neither Wesleyan nor anti-Wesleyan, having never been affirmed or denied by Wesley. In his article Dr. Clark uses many expressions which describe justification in high terms, and which, if toned up to a high interpretation, would seem to imply entire sanctification; but so does Wesley. There is, perhaps, nothing in the article stronger on this point than the following words of Wesley:—"The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. He is 'born again, not of blood, nor of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' He is a child of God, a member of Christ, an heir of the kingdom of heaven. 'The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus.' His very body is a 'temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God through the Spirit.' He is 'created anew in Christ Jesus:' he is *washed*, he is *sanctified*. His heart is purified by faith: he is cleansed 'from the corruption that is in the world.' 'The love of God is shed

abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto him.' And so long as he 'walketh in love,' (which he may always do,) he worships God in spirit and in truth. He keepeth the commandments of God, and doth those things that are pleasing in his sight: so exercising himself as to 'have a conscience void of offense, toward God, and toward man.' And he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified."

This passage contains expressions which, if Dr. Clark had used, would have been quoted as anti-Wesleyan. That is, both writers describe rather than define. A high-toned interpretation of Wesley would make him contradict himself, and a high-toned interpretation of Clark would make him contradict Wesley under a low-toned interpretation. We understand Dr. Clark as affirming that the work of the Lord in justifying, and at the same time regenerating and sanctifying the man, is perfect and complete after the then possible lesser measure, and not according to the future fuller measure. And we see nothing anti-Wesleyan in it.

We shall now be asked in tones of terrible stage thunder why we published an article containing such a divergency in the Quarterly. Before we answer that question we must ask our dear thunderers what they are making this mighty racket about. They are themselves ready enough to accept and eulogize Methodist books and articles containing very strong anti-Wesleyan positions. Dr. Raymond's "Theology" is anti-Wesleyan on the very important topic of eternal retribution, yet the Standard heralded that work in its columns under stately capitals as "A Great Book," and eulogized it, if we rightly recollect, without qualification. Dr. Curry, in the Advocate, abolished the bodily resurrection, and in the Repository has abolished the judgment-day; yet when the learned doctor avowed himself to be "Inskipian," inventing that graceful adjective in order to invest himself with it, the "Inskipian" organ gracefully and gratefully responded, if we rightly recollect, by pronouncing him "the foremost editor in Methodism." We object not to the eulogies on the book or on the editor; but we do object to this inconsistency, if not insincerity, in indorsing any and every other heresy, and yet putting on such fierce visages and unpacking themselves in such fierce fulminations upon such a divergency as Dr. Clark's. We must charge these brethren with playing fast and loose. They have assumed to take one doctrine under their patronage and the Church under their authority, and while all other doctrines may be denied, this one article must be strictly maintained under penalties.

They threatened that if the late Dr. Lore editorially opposed them they would undermine the subscriptions to the Northern Advocate. They proposed to burn Dr. Crane's book in "the stove;" they called upon the Church authorities to put him down; they wrote to the editor of the Quarterly to speak out and demolish him officially and ecclesiastically. What our revolt at their spirit and conduct was we have freely expressed in a former Quarterly; and we now say it deliberately, that we hold all their professions of superior sanctity to be a serious mistake.

On our statement in our last Quarterly that it was by the light of another world only that life in this world is relieved from pessimism, Mr. M'Donald thinks proper to say that if we were sanctified we would not think so. Our sentiment, we reply, was the same as that of Muhlenberg's hymn. One of our own sweetest hymns most sweetly sings—

> "Lord! obediently we'll go,
> *Gladly leaving all below.*"

These words speak the deepest feelings of our own heart, and so feeling, we need none of Mr. M'Donald's volunteer prescriptions. We decline all profession of entire sanctification; we refuse all such process as these brethren enjoin; and yet we have a firm trust that we should hail with joy unspeakable the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour. Welcome be the hour of our release from these low grounds of earth, for when Christ appears, then shall we also appear with him in glory! St. Paul says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Mr. M'Donald might say, "You would not feel so, Paul, if you would only come and be sanctified like me." We imagine that the apostle would decline.

But the question remains, Why publish an article not perfectly Wesleyan? Because we believe that had John Wesley been editor of our Quarterly he would have published it. Dr. Clark is an eminent minister of the Church, South, of marked ability and piety. His article is written in the interest of holiness, and is pervaded with a devout spirit which should benefit every reader not a partisan. There are increasing thousands, many of them repelled by the intolerable assumptions of high professionalism, who would be holier Christians after Dr. Clark's interpretation than after the Wesleyan, exaggerated as that at the present day is. We believe the thoughtful men of the Church had a right to hear what he had to say on this most deeply interesting subject. The Quar-

terly is not a child's paper. It is read by the highest minds in the Church, who know what our standard doctrines are and what they ought to be. They do not require the Quarterly to be an *Index Expurgatorius*. When it comes to deciding precisely what our doctrines are, the editor has ever tried to do his best toward defining them. His definitions claim no other authority than what they derive from their real accuracy. And when they have been so defined, as the doctrine of sanctification has been editorially defined, we see no reason why the best and most tried minds of the Church may not be allowed some range. So, after having most strenuously maintained the doctrine of a literal resurrection, we did not hesitate to allow Prof. Lacroix to put in Schoberlien's views modifying that dogma. We hear very audibly the expressed demand that there shall be some freedom of expression allowed to the highest and most loyal minds in the Church who write truly and sincerely in the interest of truth and holiness. Our readers will remember that in a former Quarterly we showed up the anti-Wesleyan, or rather hyper-Wesleyan, character of the Standard; and we now say that we consider Dr. Clark less divergent, and less perniciously divergent, from Wesley than Inskip, M'Donald, or this Dr. Watson. And as to the spirit exhibited, we have only to ask any fair mind to read Dr. Clark's article and Dr. Watson's pamphlet in immediate succession, and decide on which side the real holiness lies.

We believe that our wisest men are troubled with the increasing amount of an imperious antinomianism pervading many sections of our Church, arising from the multiplication of hasty professions of entire sanctification. In an oppressively numerous class of cases that profession constitutes the man's only importance. He uses it to place himself above the just criticism to which all are rightfully amenable. To doubt his holiness is, forsooth, to be an enemy of holiness. Meantime his profession, and a fervid assertion thereof, are about the only reasons for suspecting him of any special excellence. The practices of his daily life, his bad tempers, and his questionable rectitudes, oblige him largely to draw upon the "infirmity" excuse. What would be *sin* in an unregenerate or in a poor justified man is merely human failing in him. His sins are all sanctified sins, until in his case Christ is made the minister of sin, and Christianity is demoralized into a cloak for sin. And that is antinomianism. And when such Christians grow strong in a Church they are partisan, censorious, arrogant, and the real troublers of Israel. The chiefest pastors

of our Church testify to the great increase of this portentous evil, and they very well know from what quarter the evil comes. But how pull up the tares without injuring the wheat? How reach the evil without destroying some good? How even discuss the matter and speak plain truth without offending many a truly holy soul? As a remedy, some wise and holy men, like Dr. Crane and Dr. Clark, suggest a modification of our theology. The excited manner with which such men are assailed by writers like Dr. Lowry and Dr. Watson, in contrast with the calm, devout spirit of the men themselves, shows on which side the real holiness lies. We insist that men like these, tried by long service in the Church, shall be heard, though their counsel be not adopted. And if there be thousands in the Church who can be holier under such views rather than on the second-process view, all wise men will say, *let holy life be preferred above all special dogma.*

It is painful to see the great name of Count Zinzendorf debased into a term of opprobrium by these mistaken brethren. In spite of what we consider his doctrinal errors, Zinzendorf was, as Schaff says, "one of the purest and most remarkable men in the history of Christianity, a religious and poetic genius, a true nobleman by nature and divine grace as well as by rank. He had but one all absorbing passion—Christ and him crucified." Dr. Clark's doctrine and his bear no resemblance. He taught that our sanctification is entire at justification; Dr. C. says no such thing. He taught that our sanctification is entirely imputed from Christ; Dr. C. that it is wrought in us through Christ. It is a pity that one who prints himself a D.D. should so mistake, especially after the mistake has been once corrected in our Quarterly. Dr. Clark's doctrine of sanctification is no more Zinzendorfian than it is Swedenborgian or "Inskipian."

---

*Bishop Peck's Address to the Ministerial Candidates of the Southern Illinois Conference.* Minutes, pp. 120.

Two of our bishops have expressed their views with some fullness in regard to the doctrine of Christian holiness, with the evident purpose of maintaining the thing, but of disentangling it from some present embarrassments. Bishop Merrill illustrates at full length the great doctrine, that while in various departments of existence we know the *fact*, we know but little of the *mode*. The conclusion is, that upon the subject in hand we need not be over technical or exacting about the form or the formula, if we can secure in reality and essence the thing. The argument is too con-

secutive to allow of piece-meal quotation, but our readers should study it as a whole.

Bishop Peck, in his address to the candidates of the Southern Illinois Conference, deals in points sharply and sometimes brilliantly put. He first states the Wesleyan doctrine very distinctly, and gives it as

THE UNEQUIVOCAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

I desire, my brethren, to assure you that in the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church on this subject there is nothing hidden or doubtful. The Church has no question about this doctrine. Individuals may have questions; some minds may honestly differ about some phase of this doctrine; but as to the main thing the Church has no doubt whatever. For it does seem to us that the idea that there is no definite blessing which ought to be sought, called entire sanctification or perfect love, and distinct from a love that is not perfect, is not true.—P. 92.

The Bishop then proceeds to give some *caveats*, which are specially suited to the hour. The first is upon

THE ULTRA ONE-IDEAISM.

But it is possible for a man to be so filled with zeal for holiness as to give it a technical position that will do some harm. I somewhere saw a representation of Satan laying hold of a man's shoulders who was trying to get up to a certain line; finally he gave him a push which sent him clear across it. "Well, go then," said he; "I would as soon see you on one side of the line as the other." I therefore say to you, brethren, you must not omit before the world "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," a justification by faith, and regeneration, and the beginnings of sanctification at the time of regeneration, and then going on to perfection. You must take care of the little ones, and you cannot do that by preaching the highest standards of Christian excellence chiefly and principally. You must go down where they are, and lead them upward and onward, and so preach and teach that the humblest and poorest of all can understand it. You must remember that you are not to be the pastor of a dozen persons devoted to holiness, but the pastor of the whole flock; and ninety-nine in a hundred of them, perhaps, cannot readily understand the matter. It is a great flock, and there are many weak ones. Take them all along, brethren—preach the whole Gospel. It is a Gospel of power to wicked men, and the majority of your hearers are wicked men. It is a Gospel of mercy to penitents; take them and lead them to the altar of mercy and to the Saviour of sinners. There is no work of greater importance than teaching those to walk who cannot walk themselves. A great many of the members are away down in the valley of indecision, and you must not underrate them, but form them into line, bring them up, and try them, not by the "Central Idea of Christianity," but by the Bible. Brethren, I learn that through this country there are some men who do not harmonize with us upon this question, and I partly believe it. I have found them every-where. And just the way not to give them power is at proper times and places to preach the true doctrine of Wesleyan holiness. I recommend to you not to fight them, but to preach in this way and *live it out*, and your cause will take care of itself.—P. 93.

These pointed remarks suggest a query as to the whole system of one-ideaism. The holiness association, the holiness periodical, the holiness prayer-meeting, the holiness camp-meeting, the holiness preacher, are all modern novelties. They are not Wesleyan. We believe that a living Wesley would never admit them into the

Methodist system. They seem to distort the healthful symmetry of our religion. Wisely was it asked by one of our bishops, "Are not all our meetings holiness meetings?" Is it not the purpose of our whole system to "spread Scripture holiness?"

The third caution regards

OBTRUSIVE "EVANGELISTS."

But it has come to my ears that men have been goingaround the country, entering your pastoral charges, and ignoring you and your work. Now, pastors are responsible as pastors, and brethren, men who call themselves by good names, evangelists, etc., (and do not understand me that I am against the word, for it is scriptural,) but many times it turns out that erratic men assume to themselves this title, and, without consulting with the pastor, set up for themselves, and become harsh accusers of the brethren, and preach in a way we cannot approve, and in this way do much harm.—P. 94.

A fourth touches upon

LOFTY PROFESSIONALISM.

And now a word about the profession of holiness. I am of the opinion that every man who tells his experience ought to tell the truth just as it is. And I do not think that the Church is suffering for the want of religious profession. A high profession may be quite imprudent when it only provokes resistance. But when you are in the family with your brethren and sisters, and are clear in the experience, do not suppress it. If the heart is filled with holy love, let the people know it. But then I want to tell you that if a person is filled with perfect love he will have less need to tell it. If his life is in accordance with it, he does not need to tell it; it will tell itself, and if not, his telling it will do no good. Let his life be such that the world may know that he walks with Jesus, and then when his heart is filled with perfect love he may tell it to the glory of God. I never knew any harm to come from that kind of profession. But when there was a harsh, censorious spirit, and a man did not live well, and every body knew it, I have known loud professions to do great harm. There are not wanting instances of men and women who are very irregular in their attendance at church, not very steady at the prayer-meeting, very generally away from class-meeting and yet professing perfect love.—P. 94.

These words, coming from the author of the "Central Idea of Christianity," will have great weight throughout the Church.

---

*The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ.* By GEORGE B. FISHER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College, Author of "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity," "The Reformation," etc. 8vo., pp. xii, 591. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1878.

The scope of Dr. Fisher's work is even more broad than its title would at first seem to indicate. While its first part professedly only describes the condition of the Roman world at the entrance of Christianity, it really explores the entire field of the intellectual and moral preparation for the Gospel found in the ancient religions and philosophies of Rome, Greece, and Palestine. The line of thought in the early chapters is deeply interesting, and, though not wholly new, its development is fresh, scholarly, and inde-

pendent. The introductory chapter, on "The Nature of Christianity and its Relation to the Jewish and Heathen Religions," ably delineates the divine training of the Hebrew people, and this, namely, the training of a people, and not the making of a book, it holds to have been the grand aim under both the old dispensation and the new. The method of revelation is not in the announcement of a body of doctrine, but in a series of historical phenomena, in which men act, and over which God presides in his providence, guiding, legislating, punishing, and delivering, the true import and philosophy of which are expounded by prophets and apostles. The correct exposition of the facts of the Gospel history is found in the apostolic epistles. As the history was slow in its development, the discoveries of revelation were progressive and gradual. No student of the Scriptures can have failed to mark, for instance, the steadily growing definiteness of the Messianic prophecies, the higher level of David and Isaiah than that on which Moses stood, and the slow uplifting of the idea of the kingdom of God. So Dr. Fisher would solve many of the moral difficulties in the Old Testament, by refusing to judge men and deeds of a darker age by the light of the Gospel; and this is, in our view, the correct solution. But Christianity is the perfect form of religion, in which revelation reaches culmination. It grows directly out of Judaism. It could not grow out of Platonism, or any of even the best forms of heathenism. It is not a religion of ethics chiefly, or of some special doctrine, as immortality, but it is a religion of redemption and grace. This is its essential characteristic, in which it differs from all other religions, except in its foreshadowings in the Old Testament. Dr. Fisher might well have more fully elaborated this peculiarity.

The Roman empire is regarded as a preparation for Christianity, in its breaking up of nationalities and welding them into one; in the influence of its jurisprudence in unifying the popular thought; in the assimilation of its people in language and culture; in the necessary intercourse between the different parts of the empire; and in the longing for a common religion that, with the dissolving of old beliefs, sprung up out of the confusion and ferment of the times.

Dr. Fisher devotes some seventy thoughtful pages to the consideration of the popular religions of Greece and Rome. We fail, however, to discern the "incipient tendency to monotheism" in the Homeric theology, of which he speaks. The truth is, as seems to us, that polytheism had failed to utterly obliberate the senti-

ments of the ancient religion and original monotheism, and they still gleamed, though dimly, in the darkness of paganism. Idolatry was a departure from Jehovah, and never could be a school-master to lead men to Christ. But with the Greek philosophy the case was different. Great ability marks the treatment of this question, and it is no discredit to Dr. Fisher that he reminds us often of the more thorough work of Dr. Cocker on "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." Then, with an inquiry into the morals of heathenism and the social and religious condition of the Jews, the view of the state of the world at the time of our Lord's advent is made complete.

The second division of the work examines the Gospel narratives in the light of the latest criticism. We fully appreciate the candor and thoroughness of these investigations; yet we note with some surprise the basing of the early date of these books in any degree on an alleged expectation by the apostles of our Lord's second advent in their life-time. A wise logician would naturally avoid a premise so disputable; and the assumption of such an expectation involves the fatal mistake of supposing that the Holy Ghost inspired the apostles to write a falsehood on an important point of Christian doctrine. Surely some other interpretation of the passages adduced must be found.

The third division discusses a few of the most important topics in the life of our Lord and the history of the Church in the first century. On a few points, such as the measure of apostolic authority, and the opinion that baptism was commonly by immersion, we should speak differently; yet no one can read these chapters, especially the one on "The Separation of the Church from the Temple," without profit. As a whole, the work is a valuable addition to our theological literature, and a credit to our American scholarship.

---

*The Hidden Life.* Thoughts on Communion with God. By Rev. Adolph Saphir, author of "Expository Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews," "The Life of Faith," etc.. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Carters. 1877.

Quite a number of books have been published of late on the "higher life." This one is not on the higher, but on the hidden, inner life, the conscious experience at which every true believer should aim from the beginning of his Christian life, and without a good degree of which he should at no time be content. Turning from the much debated questions in regard to the exact nature of the work wrought in regeneration, and the sense in which Christians may be said to keep the divine law, the author treats such topics as these: "Sincerity in Drawing near to God," "The Experienced Reality of Revela-

tion," "The Experienced Reality of Prayer," "The Indwelling of God by Love and the Holy Spirit," etc. The author does not presuppose doubt, and proceed to argue on antagonism, and to defend his views. He explains, and enforces, and exhorts, with all earnestness, and even enthusiasm. He sets out with the declaration that, although every mystic may not be a Christian, "every Christian is a mystic." The book, it must be confessed, agrees very well with the opening sentence. Read as a theological work, it lacks clearness, strength, and completeness. Read as an interpreter of the innermost wants, exercises, and experiences of those who are not satisfied either with the barren formalism of a machine piety, or with the cold performance of all known duty, it will be found an incentive and a guide in the deep things of the conscious religious life. Nevertheless, those who would explore these mystic realms need a solid foundation in the Law as well as in the Gospel, else they will be liable to become dreamily and sentimentally pious, resolving all religion into the things of the inner life, and forgetting that true Christians are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

The Hidden Life is an English work, although that fact is nowhere plainly stated in the volume itself.

---

*Abraham, the Friend of God.* A Study from Old Testament History. By J. Oswald Dykes, M.A., D.D. 12mo., pp. 352. New York: Carters. 1877.

If modern curiosity had been previously consulted in regard to the size of the Bible, it would have clamored for a whole library, when divine wisdom has given us only one book, and that none of the largest. With what delight would we pore over the Life of Adam, in three volumes, embellished with portraits and a map! Seth, Enos, and others in the line which extends from the Creation to the Deluge would each require an octavo, while the scientific questions which cluster around the Creation and the Deluge might be discussed in a supplemental work of moderate dimensions—six or eight volumes, perhaps. Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and others in the immediate line of succession, could not be crowded into any less space, certainly; and, by a moderate estimate, the Christian era might be reached in a hundred volumes. If all that man fancies that he would like to know were written of Christ and his apostles, their words and works and personal history, at least a hundred more volumes would be needed.

But what could the Church do with so voluminous a Bible? Certainly no society could be formed for its general gratuitous distribution. The poor could not buy it. The busy world would plead that they had no time to read it. The soldier could not carry a copy in his knapsack, nor the sailor one in his sea-chest. Books of extracts would be looked upon with suspicion as one-sided and misleading, contrived to support the notions of those who made the selections. Nay, verily; it would not do. The wisdom of the divine Author is seen, not only in what is revealed, but the brevity with which mighty truth is told.

And yet man, without the divine teachings, is constantly trying to supply what inspiration has omitted, and expanding pages of revelation into volumes of fanciful description and thoughtful moralizing. Often, as in the present case, the work is well done; and the golden nugget found in the Scripture mine is beaten into a broad expanse of shining leaf. Sometimes, indeed, it is somewhat thin in spots; and now and then, by reason of much pounding, a hole is discernible; nevertheless, the precious metal is still there, and the glittering expanse catches and holds many eyes which would hardly see the solid value of the nugget.

The work of Dr. Dykes is one of the best of its class. It supplements the brief records of Genesis with the fruit of much thought, as well as varied acquisitions of modern Bible study and historical and geographical inquiry. Now and then he employs his fancy, but it is only to put a little flesh upon the dry bones of the story, and it is always done in the best of good taste. No thoughtful reader will close the book without feeling that "Abraham, the Friend of God," and the persons and events of his time, stand before his eyes with clearer outline and more vivid coloring than before, and that the hours spent in the reading have been well employed. C.

---

*Brighter than the Sun*; or, Christ the Light of the World. A Life of our Lord for the Young. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. With Illustrations by A. ROWAN. 8vo., pp. 433. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

Dr. Macduff could crown his life-work by no nobler task than is accomplished in this volume. He has, heretofore, written, as our readers are doubtless aware, of Bethlehem, Sychar, Gennesaret, Bethany, and Olivet; and now he brings his long study of the Scriptures, his observations in the Holy Land, and all his experience and skill as a writer, to the elucidation of the life and character of the One from whom those lands derive for us their highest interest. The facts of the gospel narrative are, of course, set

forth in due order, and interpreted in the light of wide reading and long study; but the charm of the book is in its vivid descrip tions of events and scenes, so that it is a fairly-pictured life of our Lord. The young person who is fortunate enough to read it will see the beautiful and wonderful story as he never saw it before. In this most important respect the work is unequaled in our language. The sixteen full-page illustrations and illuminated cover add greatly to the attraction of the volume.

---

*Theological Essays.* By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 8vo., pp. 383. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877.

The seven essays in this volume were published some years since, and have appeared in several editions, but are, for the purpose of the present publication, revised and enlarged. They abound in strong thought, firmly and clearly expressed, and in this the reader of a different school of theology will take a pleasure, while he may dissent from the theory propounded. The essays on "The Doctrine of Original Sin" and "The Atonement a Satisfaction for the Ethical Nature of both God and Man," professedly defend the old historical Calvinism, and may be accepted as its latest statement from the hand of a master in its Israel. An Arminian eager for the fray would relish the following unflinching proposition: "Every child of Adam fell from God, in Adam, and together with Adam, and, therefore, is justly chargeable with all that Adam is chargeable with, and precisely on the same ground, namely, on the ground that his fall was not necessitated, but self-determined. . . . If [Adam] fell freely, so did his posterity —yet not one after another, and each by himself—but altogether and all at once, in that first transgression." Dr. Shedd, of course, would not accept the reply that it is impossible for a man to personally will and act, and become responsible therefor, a thousand ages before he has a personal existence.

---

*Hermeneutics of the New Testament.* By Dr. A. IMMER, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by ALBERT H. NEWMAN, 8vo., pp. xvii, 395. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1877.

This work, prepared for students and practical clergymen rather than professional theologians, fully expounds the principles of New Testament exegesis which for a generation have prevailed in Germany, and are really those adopted by Grotius and other Arminians two and a half centuries ago. It is a thoroughly scientific and almost exhaustive treatise on the whole subject. It is in three

parts: I. The General Principles of Hermeneutics; II. The Single Operations of the Scripture Interpreter; III. The Religious Understanding. The elaborate history of Scripture interpretation and the several methods of exegesis that have from time to time been employed, constitutes a very important portion of the work. Our author adopts the grammatico-historical method, and rightly holds that our dogmatic preconceptions must not be the standard of our interpretation of Scripture. It is with us a fundamental proposition that we are to interpret the Holy Scriptures upon the same grammatical, historical, and logical principles on which we interpret any other document, never forgetting, however, that he will with such aid most deeply penetrate into their import whose soul is illumined by the Holy Spirit. To learn how most wisely and accurately to do this, the student can have no better guide than Dr. Immer's erudite volume. We heartily commend it to our young ministers in particular, in the belief that in mastering it they will greatly enrich their teachings of the sacred word.

---

*Future Religious Policy of America.* A Discussion of Eleven Great Living Questions. By WILLIAM RILEY HALSTEAD. 12mo., pp. 218. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

The discussions in this volume are on important and vital questions intimately connected together, and deeply affecting both the religious and secular welfare of our country. Mr. Halstead thinks strongly and writes vigorously, with the purpose of carrying his reader with him, and the hope of making him a truer Christian and better patriot. The first essay, on "Law and Providence," is itself worth the price of the volume; and of the rest, those on "Skeptical Thought," "Romanism," "Priesthood of the People," and "Inner Church Life," merit special attention. A book so important in its topics, and fresh, brave, and direct in its utterances, ought to be put into the hands of the large body of intelligent, active young men of the Church, upon whom is now devolving so much of its practical work.

---

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Final Philosophy*; or, System of Perfectible Knowledge issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion. By CHAS. WOODRUFF SHIELDS, D.D. Pp. 609. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877.

Irrelevant and inconclusive arguments are vexatious and mortifying, both to the logician and the truth-lover, even when they are offered in support of a good cause. This work claims to be

the outcome of a professorship of "Harmony of Science and Revealed Religion," and from its size and title one is justfied in expecting more than is given. Of course there is a "conflict;" and the larger part of the work is spent in describing it. The old story of the astronomical and geological conflicts is retold, with much other matter of a similar sort. This is gracefully, though somewhat sketchily done; but the reader is left in doubt to what purpose. The scanty lesson which might be drawn from this deluge of history, namely, that religion can survive profound changes in our cosmical conceptions and scientific theories, seems nowhere to be hinted at. We are of opinion that the "conflict and reconciliation" business is very much overdone on both sides, and is really a sure mark of hopeless superficiality. In truth, the presented conflict is mainly a conflict of old and new science, and not a religious question at all. It has a religious significance only because our religious sentiments become adjusted to certain conceptions which constitute the reigning science; and when those conceptions change there must be re-adjustment. In the first shock of surprise, and especially where mental ossification has set in, we fancy that religion has been damaged, if not destroyed. In the law this same aversion to re-adjustment produces violent opposition to law reforms. In medicine it sets the schools at war, and makes any startling change an occasion for persecution. In politics it produces conservatism. Whenever and wherever a new order appears it will have to make its way against the old. Had Dr. Shields mastered this simple thought, it would have very much altered the plan of his work. It is a miracle that the science of the Bible should have been as pure as it is, especially considering the state of scientific knowledge at that time; but the wonder consists mainly in the fact that so little science of any kind found its way into the Bible. The belief in the divine omnipresence was so overpowering that no theory of second causes was needed or allowed. Hence the science of the Bible is seldom any thing but pure theism, with all secondary causes left out. This is the cause of its scientific purity, and the reason why there is so little where the Bible can possibly collide with any form of science which remains theistic. But when Paul in his prayer adopts the threefold division of body, soul, and spirit, or when in his vision he speaks of the third heaven, we find no reason for calling these or any similar statements more than the prevailing science upon these points at that time. For ourselves, therefore, we have little respect either for the writers of "conflicts," or for the writers of

"reconciliation." The method of the former is to sweep a dragnet through the past, and collect all the horrors which have attended progress, and then charge them all to religion. The latter commonly has no method, except meekly to allow all the slanders and libels of the former, and then cry out, "For any sake, don't!" In this way the notion has got abroad that all scientific people are irreligious, and that all religious people are unscientific. Along with this goes the notion that any dogmatism may be called science if only it be grossly impious. Now, in the face of the facts that the bulk of our scientific men have always been Christians, and that atheists and materialists have contributed almost nothing to the advance of knowledge in any department, we submit that it is high time to abandon this pernicious habit of speaking of science and religion as hostile powers. Dr. Shields's conception of what is really needed in this department is painfully inadequate, if we are to judge by this work. So far as there is any conflict, it reduces to the question whether certain facts and doctrines are true or false. Such are the doctrines of theism, of the supernatural control of things, of revelation, etc. Has any thing been discovered which discredits these beliefs? Here is the knot of the problem; and all fruitful discussion in this field must confine itself to these points. Mere general talk about the hostility of science and religion is unworthy any rational being, whether scientific or religious. Philosophic discussion of the problems indicated will always be valuable when the work is well done. All other "reconciliations" are worthless at best, and often by their lack of reason they lead the superficial, who are always willing to burn their fingers, if they can, to imagine that nothing can be said. Dr. Shields has not given us any thing conclusive, and he has not shown any just appreciation of the question at issue. One can hardly look at the 609 pages of this large octavo without inquiring "To what purpose was this waste made?" It is a relief to get a hint from the preface that the chair of "Harmony, etc.," is not a permanent institution. If President White's "Warfare" and Dr. Draper's "Conflict" were to meet with a terrible retribution for their philosophic shallowness, we know of no infliction more adequate, and more poetically just, than that those authors should be forced to study the Final Philosophy.

---

*Contemporary Art in Europe.* By S. G. W. BENJAMIN, Author of "The Turk and the Greek," "What is Art?" etc. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 165. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

This volume is issued in the belief that our country is just entering upon an era of art development, and with the purpose of in-

struction in the principles which underlie a true art culture. It takes us successively to England, France, and Germany—to their painting, sculpture, and architecture—describes their characteristics in those countries respectively, introduces us to their artists and art schools, and illustrates the text by seventy-seven engravings. The book, with its illuminated cover and elegant press-work, is itself a fine specimen of our American art.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Summer Rambles in Europe.* By ALEXANDER CLARK, Author of "The Gospel in Trees," "The Old School-house," "Work-day Christianity," "Starting Out," etc. Printed for the Author. 16mo., pp. 280. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1877.

Never did worn and weary editor more joyously drop office and work for the rest of vacation, or ramble hither and yon, and tell the story of his ramblings with a freer *abandon*, than did our genial friend and brother of The Methodist Recorder in the summer of 1876. His route of travel lay through Great Britain and north-western Europe, and rather in a line of his own choosing than in the usual one prescribed by fashion. He saw with his own eyes and thought with his own brain, and from time to time sent home some account of it all, to the great delight, we are sure, of his readers; and now from those letters and other equally rich material this book is made. It is thoroughly readable, from the excellent portrait fronting the title-page to the end. Whether it tells of exploring English castles, sitting in Shakspeare's house, meeting the Primitive and New Connection Methodists in conference, mangling Dutch to an English waiter, studying art galleries and cathedrals, roaming in the Black Forest, or lingering in John Calvin's church, in Geneva, one wearies not of its pages. Its style is perpetually varying with the author's moods—now bright, sportive, and keen as a Damascus blade, and anon sober as the grave. With plenty of entertaining incident and anecdote, and charming description of scenes, places, and people, Dr. Clark has happily combined many profound thoughts and important facts, making an instructive as well as pleasant volume.

*Lectures on Baptist History.* By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

We have here three hundred and fifty pages of reading that kindles the best sort of feeling, and is very rich in historic allusions

and the clearest and most beautiful rhetoric. The title of the book is somewhat unfortunate in suggesting dull statements and sectarian defenses, but the name of the author is an agreeable offset to the title. The twelve chapters in the volume are entitled, "John the Baptist," "The Kingdom of God as set up by Christ," "Baptism and Regeneration," "The Church as Left by Christ and as Made by Man," "Our Churches under the Ban of Antichrist," "The Anabaptists of the Continent and England," "Rationalism in its Relation to our Churches," "The Baptists and Religious Liberty," "The Baptists of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate," "John Bunyan," "Baptists and Missions," and "Baptists and the Future." The two prime chapters in the book are the one on "John the Baptist" and the one on "John Bunyan." That on "John the Baptist" presents, perhaps, as complete a delineation of the Great Forerunner as has ever been made. One fairly sees the hardy preacher of the wilderness in the midst of five thousand swarthy Syrians, clothed in his rough coat and leathern girdle, and shaking the hearts of his startled hearers as the forest is shaken by the tempests of winter. The illustrations of this chapter are as fresh and fragrant as the flowers of spring, and as rugged as the mountains. They are the legitimate children of the talented writer. Dr. Williams has earned a foremost place among the scholarly writers of the religious school in this country. He is a true poet, and a genuine, liberal-hearted Christian. It is a little amusing that the good doctor should have made John the Baptist a frontispiece to a book on "Baptist history." It is simply playing with a word. The old agitator, the rugged interferer with the conscience of Herod and the brazen sins of his sister-in-law, Herodias, belonged to the Baptist society about as much as Paul to the Presbyterian, or St. Peter to the Methodist. All these old-time saints had finished their course with joy long before *our* time people had ever been thought of, and to snatch them up as figure-heads to our little ships is an arrangement that those masterly men who were in at the beginning of things would hardly appreciate. Take it all in all, our sister denomination may feel proud of their historian, and American literature of this new book.

---

*Among the Turks.* By CYRUS HAMLIN. 12mo., pp. 378. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

Dr. Hamlin has given us a volume of surpassing interest, both for its incidents and personal narrative illustrative of life in Turkey, and for its information respecting the condition and progress of the

empire. It is now forty years since he was sent by the American Board to take charge of its educational work at Constantinople, and to him is chiefly due the success of Robert College, on the Bosphorus. The chapter relating to this Christian institution, whose students are gathered from eighteen native cities, twelve languages, and all religions, and in whose faculty American, Greek, Armenian, Bulgarian, German, Italian, French, and Turkish professors labor in harmony, is one of the most interesting in the book. In Dr. Hamlin's thirty-five years in Turkey he has become thoroughly conversant with its condition, its laws, institutions, religions and social life. Many of his pages illustrate them by graphic narratives of travel, personal experience, and interesting incidents. The three concluding chapters, entitled, "Mohammedan Law," "Islam," and "Signs of Progress," convey some ideas widely different from those commonly cherished, and his facts show a large progress made in the last half-century. He believes in Turkey, notwithstanding all its errors. No rebel cruiser in our late war was allowed to be got up in Turkish waters; and even toward an enemy he holds it neither immoral nor unchristian to allow the truth. He points to the schools, the books used, the fifty newspapers (thirty of them dailies) of the capital, the Scriptures freely sold in twenty languages, the growing literature, and some remarkable changes in the administration of affairs. The long list of names of Christian subjects who have been admitted to high civil offices as ministers, viziers, and embassadors is significant. His prescription for the *sick man* is Peace, Time, and Education.

---

*The Two Circuits:* A Story of Illinois Life. By J. L. CRANE. 12mo., pp. 502. Chicago: Jansen, M'Clurg & Co. 1877.

A curious conglomerate of broad humor, keen wit, shrewdness, good sentiment, bad taste, bad English, and typographical errors, in the life of a western itinerant, done in *opera bouffe.*

In the middle of October, 18—, Philip Force sets out on his first circuit, and in the space of one short year passes through four hundred and forty pages of variegated experiences. He forms the acquaintance of a large number of people, good and sensible in the main, but coarse in manner, and generally given to the use of language which requires to be spelled in new and fantastic ways. There are no indications of a plan till the reader is more than half through the book. On page 329 Mr. Force meets a little damsel of sixteen, and, notwithstanding his solemn engage-

ment to Mary, is smitten with the charms of Kate, who is equally smitten. He is loyal to his first choice, however, and never tells his second love till the proper moment arrives. But Mary comes to visit a friend, rides a runaway horse, is thrown to the ground, and departs this life pathetically. Kate is adopted by a rich relative and disappears, and Force, in a very depressed state of mind, goes to Conference, and receives a new appointment, where he blossoms into a great preacher. A robbery, a murder, and a suicide throw their shadows on the canvas. Kate comes upon the scene again, and just in the nick of time. Force finds in a borrowed book a letter written to Kate's mother by the rich relative, in which she informs the said mother that she, the said relative, suspects that Kate is afflicted with a secret attachment to a young minister by the name of Force. After this revelation, no judicious reader will need to be informed of the result. They marry triumphantly.

The book, with its sense and its nonsense, its burlesques and broad farces, its admixture of parlor and stable scenes, its numerous cats and dogs, pigs and horses, will be popular, we judge, among people similar in mind and manners to those chiefly described in it. A score of appropriate illustrations assist the imagination of the reader. C.

---

*Growth of the Spirit of Christianity from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era.* By Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.A. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 375, 396. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877.

American readers of theological works from abroad will recognize Mr. Matheson as the author of a spicy and instructive little book on "Aids to the Study of German Theology." In this last undertaking we find him entering a new and broader field, and indulging in generalizations and groupings which put his powers to the severest test. He seems to endeavor to furnish, though without formally stating it, an antidote to Lecky's "Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Skepticism in Europe."

The general treatment of the subject is the more difficult because it is the old ground covered by Neander, Rothe, Pressensé, and just now by our American Fisher. We give Matheson's drift: Christianity was a divine phenomenon, and, while it had the power to destroy error, it could also assimilate to itself every thing pure and good in the contemporaneous ethnic faiths. In this way it asserted its prerogatives. Its method of meeting other religions proved its sympathy with universal man. Paul was the

boundary line marking the beginning of the universal Christian supremacy. The Church never showed its full grandeur until persecuted. Its divinity shone through the fire. It would not compromise with error. It could not undergo mixture. Hence, Gnosticism became its foe. The union of the Church with the State under Constantine was without conscience on his part, but it was not without its use in preparing Christianity for its future relations with man in his social and political life. Scholasticism, with all its quibbles, was educating, in that it proved a discipline for the mind endued with truth, in its great long fight with error. But the failures of the schoolmen were numerous, and their work would have been entirely fruitless but for the saving Reformation of the sixteenth century. Not all the errors of scholasticism disappeared with Protestantism, but it was henceforth powerless for evil. The mediæval heart had been yearning for the joy of deliverance from the long bondage, and at last it came with the Vulcan of the Erfurth monastery. But Luther's work was not simply a new departure; it was reflexive upon the half-dead Roman Catholicism. All that Romanism possesses to-day that is worthy of honor has been derived from Protestantism. Its greatest foe has been its saving force.

---

*Autobiography of Rev. William Arnot*, Minister of the Free St. Peter's Church, Glasgow, and afterward of the Free High Church, Edinburgh: and Memoir by his daughter, Mrs. A. Fleming. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

The Rev. Mr. Arnot was born at Scone in 1808, and died at Edinburgh, June 3, 1875. His father was a farmer, and the son spent his early boyhood employed, as far as his years admitted, in the same occupation. He afterward was apprenticed to a nobleman's gardener, and, while learning the trade, felt the power of divine truth, and became a member of the Presbyterian Church. From his childhood he had manifested mental activity and a thirst for knowledge; but the quickening influence of religion upon his mind was such, that his whole plan of life was changed. He studied for the ministry, and in 1837 was licensed to preach by the University of Glasgow, and was appointed assistant to the Rev. John Bonar, who had charge of two country Churches. Remaining about a year in this position, he became pastor of St. Peter's Church, Glasgow, where he remained from 1839 to 1863, when he was called to the Free High Church, Edinburgh, where he spent the remainder of his life. Thus it appears that, entering

upon his work at the age of thirty-one years, he spent thirty-six years in the ministry, and died at the age of sixty-seven.

The life here set forth contains nothing but "such as is common to man;" nothing of romance or tragedy, but honest Christian living and good Christian work in the sphere to which God had called.

Mr. Arnot was a faithful minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring all the counsel of God, and laboring earnestly among the people, the poor and the friendless as well as the rich and the respectable. He found time, also, to do good with his pen, writing much for religious periodicals, and publishing a number of volumes on "The Church in the House," "The Roots and the Fruits of the Christian Life," etc. He also found time to visit the Continent and America, coming hither in 1870 as a delegate from the Free Church of Scotland to the United Assembly of the Presbyterian Churches, and in 1873 to attend the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York city. The work is a pleasant record of a good man's life, and especially interesting to those who knew him personally, or through his writings.

## *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*Alcohol and the State; A Discussion of the Problem of Law, as Applied to the Liquor Traffic.* By ROBERT C. PITMAN, LL. D., Associate Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts. 12mo., pp. 406. New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House. 1877.

Alcohol is the rending devil that possesses what are termed the Christian nations; and every-where his victims are seen, ofttimes falling into the fire and oft into the water, or gnashing their teeth in drunken madness, and wallowing on the ground foaming. And many that see and deplore the ruin wrought, and have tried one expedient after another with only partial success, or none at all, are in much the same state of mind as were the disciples when they asked their Lord privately, "Why could not we cast him out?" We do not believe that this problem will always defy solution, or that the successful way of working will be forever hidden. Nay, the way has already been found, and the volume before us shows very clearly where it lies.

Judge Pitman's valuable work is divided into two general parts. Part I, "Alcohol versus the State," contains ten chapters on Waste, Destruction of Home, Pauperism, Public Health, Crime, Vitiation of Human Stock, The Universal Ally of Evil, The Universal Antagonist of Good, etc. It comprises about one fifth of

the book. Part II, "The State versus Alcohol," contains sixteen chapters, and discusses topics of vital importance, such as these: The Province of Law, The Extent of Legislative Power, License Laws and their Failure, Half-way Measures, Prohibition a Success, Law as a Teacher, Enforcement.

We wish to say, with emphasis, that among the numerous volumes published in furtherance of the temperance reform, we can hardly name one so deserving of careful study as this. The personal character of the author assures us of his candor and truthfulness; his position in the judiciary of his State vouches for his eminent qualifications for the task to which he addresses himself. The thorough research evident every-where shows that nothing has been lost by reason of haste or impatience, while the calmness of the style gives increased weight to the conclusions reached. Judge Pitman's verdict is, that legal prohibition of the traffic is the right weapon with which to fight the gigantic foe, and that prohibitory legislation is right in principle, justified by the magnitude of the interests directly involved, and abundantly proved to be efficient by numerous local experiments in England and America. We trust that this work will obtain the wide circulation to which its great merits entitle it, and we are sure that if it does it will give a powerful impetus to the greatest reform of the age.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*The Protestant Queen of Navarre, the Mother of the Bourbons.* By VIRGINIA F. TOWNSEND. Four Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 329. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Illustrated Historical Sketches.* By ANNIE MYRTLE. Sixty-one Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 366. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Pictures from our Portfolio.* Arranged by ANNIE MYRTLE. One Hundred Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 206. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*Distinctive Feature of Methodism.* By Rev. L. D. BARROWS, D.D. 18mo., pp. 44. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*The Boys' Pocket Library.* Vol. I. 24mo., pp. 249. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*The Kirkwood Library.* By Mrs. EMILY HUNTINGTON MILLER. Five Volumes. "Summer Days at Kirkwood," "The Bear's Den," "A Year at Riverside Farm," "Uncle Dick's Legacy," "Fighting the Enemy." 16mo. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

*A Knight of the Nineteenth Century.* By Rev. E. P. ROE, Author of "Near to Nature's Heart," "From Jest to Earnest," "What Can She Do?" "Opening a Chestnut Burr," "Barriers Burned Away," etc. 12mo., pp. 582. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1877.

*Little and Wise;* or, Sermons to Children. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston. 16mo., pp. 357. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1877.

*Short Studies on Great Subjects.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Third Series. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1877. Price, $2 50.

Nine essays on a variety of topics, mostly republications, in the easy, graceful style of the former series.

*Elsie's Children.* A Sequel to "Elsie's Motherhood." By MARTHA FINLEY (Farquharson,) Author of the Story of "Elsie," "Casilla," "Wanted a Pedigree," "Old Fashioned Boy," etc., etc. Pp. 340. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co.

*A Golden Christmas.* Being Longley's Manual for 1877. Pp. 112. London: F. E. Longley.

*Our Children's Songs.* Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 207. New York: Harper & Bros. 1877.

*The Khedive's Egypt;* or, The Old House of Bondage under New Masters. By EDWARD DE LEON, Ex-Agent and Consul-General in Egypt. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 435. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Personal Appearance and the Culture of Beauty, with Hints as to Character.* By T. S. SOZINSKEY, M.D., Ph.D. 12mo., pp. 196. Phila.: Allen, Lane, & Scott. 1877.

*The Expositor,* July, 1877. Edited by Rev. SAMUEL COX. Contents: 1. The Holiness of Jesus Christ. 2. St. John's View of Jesus on the Cross. 3. The Reign of Law an Incentive to Prayer. 4. The Gospel of the Uncircumcision. 5. A Chapter of Gospel History. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

*Illustrated Annuals.*

*Art Decoration applied to Furniture.* By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 237. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Pottery and Porcelain of all Times and Nations.* With Tables of Factory and Artists' Marks for Use of Collectors. By WILLIAM C. PRIME, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 531. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*The Book of Gold and other Poems.* By JOHN TOWNSEND TROWBRIDGE. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 81. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Novels.*

*In Silk Attire.* By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "Green Pastures and Piccadilly," "A Princess of Thule," "Three Feathers," "A Daughter of Heth," "Madcap Violet," etc. 12mo., pp. 313. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*A Modern Minister.* Two Volumes. Illustrated. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 166. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*What He Cost Her.* By JAMES PAYN, Author of "Won—Not Wooed," "The Best of Husbands," etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*A Young Wife's Story.* By HARRIETTE BOWRA. 8vo., pp. 121. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Marjorie Bruce's Lovers.* By MARY PATRICK. 8vo., pp. 105. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Carita.* By Mrs. OLIPHANT, Author of "Mrs. Arthur," "For Love and Life," "Squire Arden," "Chronicles of Carlingford," "Innocent," etc. etc. 8vo., pp. 193. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

## WESLEY AS A GREEK BISHOP.

We have inserted the Article on the supposed Erasmian ordination of Wesley as bishop, not because we are at all convinced of its reality, but because it needed discussion, and because the best possible argument in its behalf is already furnished by Dr. Phoebus. Yet we hold the argument to be so total a failure as to set the question fairly at rest.

1. The only testimony in its behalf is the statement of Dr. Peters. But the article of Mr. Kingsley, preceding, completely shows that

Peters is no authority at all. His inveracity is such as to cancel all he says. Yet even he does not pretend to be "in the secret;" that is, he was not present, and does not know when or where it was done, or who were the actual witnesses. He mentions a few persons who, as he says, believed it, but does not pretend that even those persons were present. There is no other reason than his word for believing that the persons named believed it.

2. The statement at the close of Peters' letter that Charles Wesley believed it is abundantly contradicted by Charles Wesley's own words. His charge against John was that he "consecrated a bishop" without himself being a bishop. The least thought in Charles Wesley's brain that John was a truly ordained bishop would have expunged his entire argument.

3. As to the faintness of Wesley's denial, it is plain that he denied all that was charged. Neither Lloyd, nor the searching Toplady, nor any other man in England, imagined that the ordination was really *performed;* they only charged that it was *asked*, and that Wesley denied. From that day to this nobody in England ever charged that it was *performed*, except Peters.

4. Peters' stories seem contradictory. Wesley, by his account, did not dare to admit to "a clergyman" that he had been ordained a bishop, yet he is ready to ordain Seabury, which would be in itself a conspicuous admission of his own ordination. Moreover, the statement that he was ready to *act* as a successionally ordained bishop, and yet not so sign himself, is absurd enough.

5. We imagine that no date can be fixed when Wesley commenced autocrat. He was autocrat from the beginning, only his autocracy ruled a smaller domain. As the masses grew larger, and the questions more momentous, his autocracy grew into larger action. His express declaration that successalism was a "fable" is proof that no action of his was based on episcopal succession.

6. The story of Peters dishonors Wesley. It makes him violate the law of the land and incur a severe penalty to obtain an honor he dared not acknowledge, and so could never use. He might, indeed, have avoided the penalty by securing due proof of his episcopate to be read after his death in support of the American episcopacy. But that he never did. On the contrary, his diploma for Coke to use in America assigned reasons for his ordination of Coke which contradict the idea of his own successional episcopate.

We should deem the fact of such an ordination a great danger to the free and voluntary nature of an episcopacy.

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1878.


## ART. I.—EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY.

[FIRST PAPER.]

SCIENTISTS, so-called, are now more than ever making battle over the Mosaic history, and Christian apologists are too ready in conceding the ground to them. Colenso abandons the verity of the sacred narrative itself; Stanley, after Ewald, pleads lamely for its alleged inaccuracies; Tayler Lewis tries to synchronize the demiurgic "days" with the indefinite periods of geology; and J. P. Thompson virtually surrenders the patriarchal generations in favor of the longer cycles presumed to be called for by the Egyptian annals. Böckh requires for these last a space of 5702 years B. C.; Brugsch, 4455; Lepsius, 3892; and Bunsen, 3623. But the Hebrew text allows only 2515 years B. C. for the flood, on the most liberal extension of the *lacunæ* in the period of the Judges, (the Rabbins make it 2104, Usher, 2348;) and if, with many accommodating chronologers, we adopt the longer scheme of the Septuagint version, we gain but little toward an approximation, (Jackson, 3170; Hales, 3155.)

Here, indeed, is a difficulty! No wonder that interpreters and historians have puzzled themselves with the problem, and ordinary scholars have altogether eschewed the task of its solution. The case, however, is not hopeless. Among acknowledged experts in this branch of archæology, Osburn ("Monumental History of Egypt," London, 1854, 2 vols., 8vo.)

makes violent efforts at adjustment, adding or retrenching whole centuries in a dynasty at a stroke. Others have been more sober. Reginald Stuart Poole, by an ingenious parallelism of the Egyptian dynasties, which he states was first suggested by Mr. Lane, reduces their commencement to B. C. 2717, (*Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, London, 1851, 8vo.) The well-known Sir Gardiner Wilkinson adopts this arrangement, but expresses himself more cautiously as to the duration of the early dynasties, beginning his definite dates with the fourth and fifth, B. C. 2450, (Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii, 289, Am. ed., where his latest views are given.) Among scholars not professed Egyptologists we may mention the late learned Dr. Samuel Farmer Jarvis, who diligently applied himself to these studies, and succeeded in detecting many of the causes of discrepancy, ("Church of the Redeemed," Boston, 1850, 8vo., appendix.) We propose to state concisely the substantial contents of the original sources, both monumental and historical, from which the chronology in question is derived; to ascertain briefly what is their respective authority; to examine their principal coincidences and variations; and to see if any rational method of reconciliation has been or can be devised.

I. *The Monumental Records, and their Use.*—These we enumerate in the order of their completeness and importance.

1. *The Hieratic Papyrus of Turin.*—This contains a regular list of the Egyptian kings from the first (Menes) down to the close of the fifteenth dynasty, written in the sacred (or cursive hieroglyphic) character, on a single sheet of papyrus, and now preserved in the Museum at Turin. It gives not only the names and their chronological order, but likewise the years, and, generally, months, and even days, of the reigns of most of them, with intimations of their divisions into dynasties and families. It was evidently drawn from State documents, and were it perfect it would be of inestimable value. Unfortunately, however, it is literally composed of innumerable fragments, of all shapes and sizes, with numerous gaps between them, and abrasions on the edges.* As we looked upon its

* On recurring to our memoranda, made on the spot, we find that, although the entire papyrus is scarcely a yard square, we counted more than 400 separate pieces, following the lines of juncture by the eye. The blank spaces are very numerous, and scattered all over the document, especially at the beginning, being of all forms and sizes, from one tenth of an inch to an inch and more in diameter.

tattered appearance in the glass frame where it is kept in the Museum, we felt bitterly disappointed when we reflected how easily its bits might have been wrongly put together, and what errors may have resulted from the conjectural arrangement of its scraps and the *lacunæ*.* We said to ourselves, Is it possible that this piece of patchwork is held up as of paramount authority on this subject, to the exclu-

* "This papyrus is broken into very small fragments, which were put together about twenty [now forty] years ago by Seyffarth, a German scholar, and the originator of a mode of reading hieroglyphics which has long been exploded as a mere flight of fancy. It was according to the interpretation of its meaning which he imagined his system afforded that he pasted together the scattered morsels of the papyrus that remained of this manuscript. Champollion had perceived that it was a list of the names of kings when he first visited Italy, in 1825. Lepsius and Bunsen extol the arrangement of this manuscript by their countryman as a prodigy of critical acumen and mechanical exactitude, and claim for it, in its present condition, the authority of an undoubted historical document. For ourselves, after some experience in the arrangement of broken papyri, both in this country and in Egypt, we must confess we are altogether in the dark as to the principle upon which Seyffarth proceeded in the restoration of the confused mass of morsels of papyrus inscribed with a writing of which it now plainly appears he did not know a single character. Until this point is explained, we feel at a loss to understand the grounds upon which we are required to accept as facts of undoubted history the royal names of which it contained a list, and which, according to the calculations of Lepsius, amount to about 250."—Osburn, "Monumental History of Egypt," vol. i, p. 227. "Such is the vagueness of form in the hieratic characters, that no two students are yet agreed as to the import of the majority of the kings' names contained in it."—*Ibid.*, p. 124. "If we have rightly divined the purpose for which the Turin Papyrus was compiled, it will certainly follow that it was a history of the succession of the kings of Egypt written for the express purpose of prepossessing the minds of the young persons for whose use it was intended with notions of the antiquity of the kingdom as inflated as it was possible to induce them to receive. The proof of this is evident enough. The list begins with dynasties of gods reigning in Egypt for untold millennia. Then follow the demi-gods, whose rule in Egypt lasted for 23,200 years. Menes and the rest of the mortals, down probably to Amosis, the conqueror of Memphis, follow these, as in the Greek lists, which were evidently copied from similar documents. We repeat the same objection, *in limine*, to this Egyptian original that we before urged against the Greek translations. If we admit all the 250 kings which it probably enrolled as the names of real men, upon what principle do we reject all the gods? It is just as easy to invent the one as the other, and to write the names of fictitious kings in hieratic characters as in Greek or any other letters. In a point of general direction, like the one we have deduced from it, the Turin papyrus may serve as history; but to translate, as best we may, the hieratic characters into hieroglyphics, and to present them in the order in which they occur there, and upon its sole authority, as authentic lists of the kings of Egypt, is, in our judgment, to write history upon very slender evidence."—*Ibid.*, ii, 125 *seq.*

sion of well-preserved and unmutilated annals? Lepsius and Wilkinson have, indeed, both published it as restored, but it certainly could never have been got together intelligibly without the aid of some other document. Moreover, it omits altogether many names found in other lists, both monumental and historical; it gives the names of very many which the others ignore; it often divides the dynasties differently from them, (making in all but eight instead of fifteen, if the principal divisions only are reckoned, and eighteen if the subdivisions are included;) it gives no regnal years for the first two dynasties, and disagrees in almost every instance in the rest with those assigned by the parallel histories; finally, the names themselves, where legible, frequently exhibit slight, if any, traces of those contained in the other accounts. In short, the whole list confuses the subject nearly as much as it helps.

2. *The Tablet of Abydos.*—This is a similar but far less extensive list of kings, carved in ovals with hieroglyphics proper on the walls of one of the subterranean passage-ways in the temple called the Memnonium, at Abydos, in Upper Egypt. We were disappointed, when there, in not being able to see it, as the passage has been closed up by order of the Egyptian Government.* This tablet contains the names of seventy-seven kings, of the first nineteen dynasties, beginning with Menes, and ending with Rameses III., (B. C. cir. 1155.) The length of none of the reigns is given; very many omissions occur, (for example, the whole of the seventh, ninth, and fifteenth dynasties;) and the names agree but vaguely with those known in history.

There is also an "old Tablet of Abydos," found in an adjoining temple, now in the British Museum, which was evidently copied from the above, and contains the names of only a part of the same kings.

3. *The Tablet of Sakkárah.*—This is a block similar to the last, found in the mortuary chapel of a priest at Sakkárah, in Lower Egypt, and now in the Museum at Cairo. (It was not there, however, when we visited the Museum, not having returned from the Vienna Exposition.) It contains the names of fifty-seven kings, beginning in the middle of the first dynasty, and

* We have, however, in our hands the account of it, with a fac-simile, published by M. Mariette in the *Revue Archéologique*, (1866.)

ending with Sethos I., (B. C., cir. 1300.) It corresponds in the main quite closely to the Tablet of Abydos, but it contains several more names, while it omits a few, and leaves out the whole of the eighth dynasty, which that Tablet alone gives in full. It gives no regnal years.

4. *The Tablet in "The Hall of Ancestors,"* originally found in the rear chamber of the great temple at Karnak, Thebes, and now in Paris, contains the names of sixty predecessors of Thotmes III., in hieroglyphics proper, but not in such order and completeness as to make it very available for the present discussion. Poole gives a conjectural arrangement of its contents, (*Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, p. 126.)

5. *Detached "Stelæ."*—This name *stelæ* is given to separate inscriptions containing the name and lineage, more or less complete, of some royal or sacred personage. The most important of these are the famous "Apis Stelæ," discovered by M. Mariette in the walls of the Serapeium, or mausoleum of the deified bulls at Sakkárah. The magnificent granite sarcophagi are still open to visitors in one of the three galleries, but the inscribed slabs, to the number of five hundred, have mostly been removed to the Louvre, in Paris. They are chiefly *ex-votos* in gratitude for some piece of good fortune, and record, besides the name, etc., of the offerer, the date frequently of the current reign, and not seldom a synchronism in the life of the existing Apis. These fragmentary data are of very considerable service in fixing the duration of partial reigns, and occasionally in other ways.

More isolated inscriptions relating to a few contiguous reigns or to individual kings are found scattered among the monuments, and throw a scanty light upon the other materials, chiefly by way of corroboration or correction.

There are certain other writings extant of the ancient Egyptians, particularly the so-called "Book of the Dead," of which a perfect copy exists in the Turin Museum; but these are all purely ritualistic, and throw no light upon the present investigation. There are also numerous papyri on scientific, personal, and other subjects, which occasionally serve to correct or confirm a date.

The immense profusion of bass-relief carvings on the walls and pillars of the tombs and temples of Egypt are simply pict-

orial representations of public and private life, such as battles, hunting scenes, manufactures, religious ceremonies, and domestic operations, with accompanying descriptions in hieroglyphics, and contain little or nothing that bears directly on the question at issue. They are largely figured in the splendid tomes of Rosellini, and in several other superb works, and are given in their original colors in the elegant plates of Lepsius and others; a tolerably complete *resumé* of them may be found in the excellent volumes of Wilkinson, and they are described more or less fully in most guide-books, being open to the inspection of all tourists up the Nile. Photographs of such of them as are in positions to admit of being photographed are common, and they are more or less reproduced in nearly every commentary and Bible dictionary.

As to the usefulness of the inscriptions mentioned above—which, when carefully sifted down, are perceived to be not very extensive—it is obvious that, for strictly chronological purposes, they are but little available as independent testimony. In fact, they can hardly be deciphered with certainty, much less understood consistently, without comparison with the records of ancient historians who give the names in more definite form and order. To these latter, therefore, we are compelled at last to turn for a key to these enigmatical and conflicting lists.

II. *The Historical Documents, and their Value.*—These, so far as relates to the proper chronology of Egypt, which, as above seen, depends upon the reigns of the early kings, all resolve themselves, with the exception, perhaps, of the statements of Herodotus, which we will examine separately in the sequel, into the various recensions extant of the *history of Manĕtho.* This person is represented by ancient authorities as having been a learned Egyptian priest, of the time of the first or second Ptolemy, who wrote in Greek a poem, unimportant in this connection, and several works on the history of Egypt from the original State records. His own historical writings have utterly perished, except what remain to us in certain extracts from them cited by Josephus, and several abstracts of their contents by early Christian writers.

The fragments preserved by Josephus are two. The first of these is contained in his treatise, "Against Apion," i, 14, 15, and

gives a circumstantial account of the Hycsos or Shepherd-kings, including some chronological items, followed by a detailed list of the kings of Egypt succeeding the expulsion of the Hycsos, with the years and months of each. The second fragment is in the same treatise, (i, 26,) and relates to the exclusion of certain lepers from the land of Egypt; it contains little or no chronological data. Josephus quotes these passages solely for the purpose of controverting them as casting reflections upon the Jews. The period in question evidently embraced the fifteenth to the eighteenth dynasties, the names and years in the first and last of these corresponding tolerably well to those generally recognized. The Shepherd-kings correspond in duration to the sixteenth dynasty, and the seventeenth dynasty is wholly ignored. Unfortunately, it is just here that the Turin Papyrus falls short. The detailed list of kings in the extract of Josephus is chiefly that of the eighteenth dynasty, which is already settled from other sources. His information, therefore, adds little to our stock. It even leaves the chronological position of the Hycsos ambiguous, unless we suppose that the seventeenth dynasty was merely a parallel one.

Of far greater extent and importance are the chronographical excerpts and summaries from Manetho found in the works of Christian fathers from the third to the ninth centuries. First, Julius Africanus, bishop of Nicopolis, in Judea, wrote a history, including a "Canon," or regular list of years, and events in each, from the Creation to his own time, in which he *seems* (from his own account) to have used the dates of Manetho, although it is probable that he derived them from second hands. His own work has perished, except a few fragments; but it appears to have furnished almost if not quite the only source of information respecting the dynastic reigns of Manetho found in later writers, (except Josephus, above,) or now extant.

Secondly, Eusebius, the noted bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, composed a similar work, (*Chronicon*,) including likewise a Canon, founded on that of Africanus. The original Greek of this has (except some fragments and abridgments) likewise perished, but its substance has been preserved in three forms, namely, a translation of the Canon into Latin by St. Jerome, an Armenian version of the whole work discovered in Venice in 1820, and a recension in the Chronology of George Syn-

cellus, a Byzantine monk. Eusebius evidently modified and altered the names, dates, and order of the Egyptian kings to suit his own purposes and the notions of his day, as Africanus doubtless had done before him, and as Syncellus certainly did afterward. The result, of course, is a series of almost inextricable discrepancies and confusions, without any real original copy, or the evidence that any of the writers followed, or even saw, the genuine Manetho. The only wonder is that the least trace of identity is recognizable among them. All that we actually have complete, it will be observed, is the Chronicle of Eusebius. Even the Latin and the Armenian translations of this disagree perpetually with each other and with the Greek, both in the length of particular reigns and in the summaries of the duration of dynasties, and in these two particulars the same list is not consistent with itself. For instance, under the very first name, Menes, (omitting the preliminary mythological reigns,) the Armenian gives 30 years, and the others 62 or 60; to the second king are variously ascribed 57, 59, and 27 years; to the third 31, 39, and 32; yet the Armenian with Syncellus sums up the dynasty as comprising 252 years, and Africanus 253, while the actual total, as in the Latin, is 263, or, more correctly, 233. In the fourth dynasty Eusebius gives 17 kings with an aggregate of 448 years, instead of 8 kings and 284 years, as in other lists. In the fifth dynasty Eusebius (giving 31 kings, instead of 9, yet with a caption stating only 8) inserts 2 by mistake from the sixth dynasty. These are but specimens of what continually occurs throughout the entire series. How is it possible out of such contradictory materials to construct a trustworthy chronology? We can get nothing except by critical conjecture, and balancing probabilities.*

We have promised to consider the list of Herodotus. It is

* "The personal character of Manetho has been made the subject of unbounded eulogy by Bunsen and Lepsius. . . . We must confess that we can see nothing in his existing works which affords any ground for the decision of such a question. Of his historical labors a few isolated fragments only are left; of his chronological work an imperfect list of kings, with the dates of their reigns in inextricable confusion, is all that remains to us. It is from the *fleshless skeleton*, as Lepsius forcibly expresses it, that we have to form our judgment of the symmetry and personal beauty of the man. We must confess our own inability to arrive at so strong a conclusion upon premises so indistinct and shadowy."—Osburn, "Monumental Egypt," vol. i, p. 181.

given in the latter part of book ii of his History, and extends from the foundation of the kingdom to the conquest of Egypt by the Persians. He professes to have derived his information directly from the Egyptian priests. He makes no mention of the dynasties, but classes his first three hundred and forty-one kings as comprising a period (evidently estimated only, and that on the extravagant basis of an average *lifetime* to each reign) of 11,340 years. Of this first series he names but twelve kings, and he gives the years of three only. They begin with Menes and end with Sethos, which two alone are recognizable in the other lists, the last being, probably, Sethi I. Then follow twelve unnamed contemporary kings, and lastly the six well-known kings (in accurate name, order, and generally correct years) who preceded Cambyses, the Persian conqueror of Egypt. Thus we gain no important help from this source for elucidating our subject.

The account of the Egyptian annals in Diodorus Siculus is evidently borrowed, with many changes for the worse, from Herodotus, and is, therefore, of no independent value. The travesties by Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, and the chronographies of Pandorus and Ammianus are apparently little if any more valuable. Even the scanty information contained in these writings, as well as that of "the old Egyptian chronicle," an early work of unknown authorship, only survives to us incorporated in the abstract of Syncellus above referred to. We are shut up to a comparison of the meager, fragmentary and uncertain data of the monuments with the imperfect, discordant and third-hand lists of Manetho. A promising task truly! But let us manfully look it in the face.

Preliminarily, however, we call the reader's special attention to the fact that none of these authorities, whether documentary or monumental, themselves belong to the early period most in dispute; they are not the testimony of contemporaries, but treat of times which they could have known only at second hand. Their comparatively late date is manifest from the point of history to which they come down. Thus Manetho gives the entire series of thirty-one dynasties, ending with the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great: he could not, therefore, have written prior to B. C. 332. The Turin Papyrus includes the fifteenth dynasty; the Tablet of Abydos, the

nineteenth; and the Tablet of Sakkárah, the eighteenth; so that none of them are older than the rule of the Shepherd-kings. The Tablet in the Chamber of Ancestors at Karnak is of the same age. These, be it remembered, are the sole vouchers for the chronology of the previous times. Besides them there is no connected list of the early kings, nor any means of fixing the dates at which they reigned. Some of those kings, it is true, are occasionally, incidentally, and in a fragmentary form, mentioned in isolated inscriptions; but these give no independent data whatever for determining their chronological position. For example, the names of the royal builders of the pyramids at Ghîzeh have been discovered carved upon the remains of those structures, but not a lisp of the time when they lived. It is only by comparing these names with those given by Herodotus, and then hunting for them in Manetho's list, that we have any clew to their exact age. We therefore emphatically repeat, that the chronological indications of the monuments, aside from these few authorities named, are all in chasmatic and disconnected items, for constructing which into a system we are absolutely dependent upon lists of comparatively modern date.

With regard to the biblical chronology the case is very different. The patriarchal genealogies, of course, were handed down from father to son; but, mark! they were definitely and carefully preserved in the family, and were not left to be gathered up, as best they might, by remote and detached hands. Moreover, the great longevity of the Hebrew patriarchs required for the transmission of the record but one link (Shem) between the Flood and Abraham, and but two links (Jacob and another of similar length of life) between Abraham and Moses. After this every event was recorded by eye-witnesses and immediate parties to the transactions themselves. The whole was finally made up under the most solemn safeguards of scrupulous veracity. On every principle of external and internal criticism we cannot justly hesitate a moment to prefer the circumstantial, positive, closely connected series of biblical annals to the laconic, vague, and conflicting schemes of Egyptologists.

We advert here, likewise, to another preliminary consideration, which we wish to dispose of separately. The regular annals in both the monumental and the historical accounts are

preceded by certain *mythical eras*. These Manetho (as extant in Eusebius) reports as follows: Reigns of *gods*, (Vulcan, the Sun, Agatho-dæmon, Cronus, Osiris, Typhon, Horus, successively,) in all, 13,900 years; followed by demigods, (heroes,) 1,255 years; again other kings, 1,817 years; then thirty other Memphitic kings, 1,790 years; next ten other Thinitic kings, 350 years; finally, manes and demigods, 5,813 years. All these he sums up as lasting for 11,000 [the real sum of the last five series is 11,025] years, which, he remarks, (evidently his own conjecture,) are merely "lunar, consisting of thirty days each." The Turin Papyrus, in like manner, prefaces the list of human sovereigns by notices of divine rulers; but the document is so greatly injured in this portion that the names and regnal years can only be made out conjecturally. There seems to be space for two hundred and fifty names, of which fragments of one hundred and nineteen alone remain; and the aggregate has been thought to be 23,200 years. The distinction of these into gods, demigods, manes, etc., is ignored. The names of six only can be made out, namely, Seb, Osiris, Seth, Horus, Thoth, Thmei; agreeing but partially with the first seven of Manetho. Herodotus (ii, 144) mentions Horus simply as succeeding Typho, the brother of Osiris, just before the commencement of the human kings. Elsewhere (ii, 43) he arranges the Egyptian gods into three classes, saying that originally there were eight, Pan and Leto being among the number; that from these there were produced twelve, of whom he names only Hercules; and again a third set from the second, whose number he does not specify, to which Dionysius belonged. By modern Egyptologers the Egyptian pantheon has been variously classified, and, in fact, it varied in the different nomes and periods. A very recent writer (Smith, "Chaldæan Account of Genesis," p. 290) has thus ingeniously restored ten of the names preceding that of Menes in the Turin Papyrus, and curiously compared them with the biblical antediluvians and the early Babylonian kings, as reported by Berosus:—

| Egyptian. | Hebrew. | Chaldæan. | Egyptian. | Hebrew. | Chaldæan. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ptha, | Adam, | Alorus. | Set, | Jared, | Daonus. |
| Ra, | Seth, | Alaparus. | Hor, | Enoch, | Ædorachus. |
| Su, | Enos, | Almelon. | Tut, | Methuselah, | Amempsin. |
| Seb, | Cainan, | Ammenon. | Ma, | Lamech, | Otiartes. |
| Hosiri, | Mahalaleel, | Amegalarus. | Hor, | Noah, | Xisuthrus. |

The coincidence is singular, and occasionally there is a slight resemblance in the names and history of each; but otherwise there is little trace of any connection.

The question has been fairly raised, If these lists of gods at the head of Egyptian annals are fabulous, or mythological, what reason have we to attach a superior degree of credibility to the *human* reigns that follow? They certainly do impair our faith in the whole catalogue; but we may, perhaps, safely concede to the advocates of Egyptian chronology that a distinction ought to be made between the dim traditions of the early period, professedly set forth as such, especially if they are but the exaggerated reminiscences of the antediluvian world, like the heroic age of most other ancient nations, and the express and orderly chronicles of a definite monarchy. It is highly edifying, nevertheless, to the lover of the Bible to perceive that the sacred Scriptures appear to furnish the true original of these pagan travesties. One important fact, at least, is tolerably evident from this investigation, namely, that the settled Egyptian history began very shortly after the flood; for that great event is the only natural boundary conceivable between the reigns of the gods and those of men.

III. *The Disagreements, and their probable Causes.*—Before discussing in detail the difficulties involved in a comparison of the monuments and Manetho, it may be well to glance at their correspondences. There is a general coincidence in the classification by means of dynasties, in the substantial identity of most of the names given in both, and in their relative order in the main. In particular they agree in beginning with Menes, (Mena,) succeeded by Athothis, (Tuta,) in introducing Amosis (Aahmes) as marking a new epoch, (after the expulsion of the Hycsos,) and in the more definite annals subsequently, (from the eighteenth dynasty.) These resemblances are sufficient to show a common origin—doubtless authentic State registers—and to establish the genuineness, on the whole, of the extracts from Manetho. But in almost all other respects the two lines diverge, especially in that most cardinal point, the number of the years of the several reigns. We have already indicated, in a general way, these and other important dissimilarities; but a proper estimate of both series of records can be obtained only by a criticism of the details. We, therefore,

bespeak the patience of the reader in following us through a somewhat dry discussion of names and numbers.

*First Dynasty*, (*Thinitic.*)—The first name, written Menes, Mena, or Meni, is agreed upon all hands to have been that of the first mortal king; its coincidence, however, with that of the reputed founder of other kingdoms, (the Lydian Manes, the Phrygian Manis, the Cretan Minos, the Indian Menu, the German Mannus,) has raised the suspicion that he, too, is a mythical character, as his predecessors certainly were. This suspicion is increased by the other circumstances related concerning him, namely, that he reigned 60 or 62 years, and was torn in pieces by a hippopotamus.* Herodotus, of course, makes him the founder of Memphis, and Eusebius attributes to him great military renown. His son and successor, Athothis, Atut, or Tuta, bears marks likewise of being a mythical personage, the Thoth or Æsculapius of the nation. His years, too, are extravagantly long, 57 or 59, (other versions 25 or 27.) His son, named Cencheres, (39, 32 or 31 years,) has no correspondent on the monuments; but the Turin Papyrus has a mutilated name in the third place, which the Tablet of Abydos supplies as Atutu. Manetho's next king, Ouanephes, the son of the preceding, (42 or 23 years,) has nothing in the monumental lists tallying with it, except perhaps Huniba in some detached inscriptions; but the Turin Papyrus again has in its fourth place a mutilated name, of which the last letter seems to be *a*, the full form, Ata, being given in the Tablet of Abydos. The fifth name is Ousaphais or Ousaphaidos, (20 years,) which agrees with the Husapati of the Turin Papyrus and the Tablet of Abydos, and apparently is the Hespti, given in a detached inscription as the fifth king of the *second* dynasty. Were these two dynasties contemporaneous? The sixth name of Manetho is Miebidos or Niebais, (26 years,) corresponding to the Merbat-pu or Merbat-pen of the three monumental lists, the Tab-

* We venture to suggest, also, that the name Adam is Hebrew for this same word, which is no other than our Aryan-English word *man*. And as Menes is Adam, so his illustrious son Athos is no other than Abel. The third name, Kenkenes, is transparently *Cain*. The queer story of Menes being destroyed by a hippopotamus is a blurred edition of Adam's being made mortal by a serpent. Just so in the Assyrian tablet Admi is slain by the sea-monster Tiamat. Very evidently, then, the Egyptian pedigree commences with a traditional patch of antediluvian history transferred to the Nile from the Euphrates.—Ed.

let of Sakkárah beginning at this point. For what reason it ignores the preceding, if they were genuine, does not appear. The seventh name of this dynasty in Manetho is Semempses, or Mempses, (18 years,) in the Turin Papyrus Mensanepher; but in the Tablet of Abydos, Ptah, (apparently only a surname, the proper name being left out,) while the Tablet of Sakkárah has no corresponding name at all in this place. The eighth and last name in Manetho is Bieneches or Oubienthis, (26 years,) where the Turin Papyrus has the fragment ....buhu, the Kebuhu of the two tablets. The sum total of this dynasty in Manetho is, as above stated, 263 [Euseb., 258; Armen., 226] years, by count, but 253 [Euseb., 252] in the heading. We give this dynasty thus in full as a specimen, but brevity will hereafter require us to limit our remarks to the notable discrepancies alone.

*Second Dynasty*, (*Thinitic.*)—Manetho here gives us 9 kings, with an aggregate of 302 (Euseb., 297) years. The Turin Papyrus likewise has 9 names, tolerably agreeing (where legible) with them, but it makes no distinction of a new dynasty till at the end of these, (which is unaccountable, as Manetho makes all the former dynasties succeed regularly from father to son, a fact which he does not subsequently note, apparently taking it for granted in each dynasty,) and it begins the second dynasty with three additional names (mutilated) not given in Manetho or in any other monumental list or inscription. The Tablet of Abydos gives the first five names only, to which the Tablet of Sakkárah adds the seventh. Detached inscriptions afford, apparently, eight still different names interspersed subsequently.

*Third Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—Here Manetho (that is, Africanus) gives 9 (Eusebius, 8) kings, with 214 (Eusebius, 197 or 198) years. The sixth, seventh, and eighth of these are evidently misplaced, as the monuments give them after the first of the next dynasty. On the other hand, the three monumental lists ignore Manetho's second, third, and fourth kings, and the Tablet of Abydos his fifth, also; but they all give in the sixth place one which he wholly omits. The Turin Papyrus gives the years of the three kings in whom all agree as 8, 16 and 19 respectively, where Manetho has 28, 16, (or 20,) and 22 respectively.

*Fourth Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—Here Manetho has 8 (Euse-

bius, 17) names, to which he attributes an aggregate of 284 (Eusebius, 448) years. The eleven best supported, including the three wrongly inserted in the preceding dynasty, would have an aggregate of 322, (Eusebius, 187.) The monuments, however, greatly reduce the long (doubtless associated) reigns, and that of Mencheres, also, should probably be reduced correspondingly, (29, [or 18,] 19, 42, 30, 63, 66, 25, [or 13,] 22, [or 10,] 7, and 9, respectively.) The monumental lists have all these names, with one more between the second and third; but the Tablet of Abydos omits the last three of the dynasty, and inserts an undecipherable name among the three transferred from the third dynasty. The Turin Papyrus gives the years of all these reigns except those corresponding to the fourth and fifth, making an aggregate of 149, (namely, 19, 6, 7, 24, 27, 8, 22, [two blank,] 18, 4, and 2½ respectively.)

*Fifth Dynasty*, (*Elephantinitic.*)—This in Manetho contains 9 (the heading erroneously says 8; Eusebius, 31) names, with an aggregate of 218 [or 205] (the heading 248) years, (28, 13, 20, 7, 20, 44, 9, 44, [or 31,] and 33, severally.) The monumental lists have a corresponding number, except the Tablet of Abydos, which omits the third. The Turin Papyrus begins the third subdivision of its second dynasty with the same third name, to which, however, it appends no regnal years. Its aggregate of years for the other 8 is 111, (namely, 7, 12, [blank,] 7, 10, 11, 8, 28, and 30, respectively.)

*Sixth Dynasty*, (*Memphitic.*)—In this Manetho's list contains 6 names, the last a queen, with an aggregate of 203 years, (30, [or 33,] 53, 7, 100, 1, and 12, severally.) The Turin Papyrus, which makes this the first section of its third dynasty, gives also 6 names, all illegible except the last, which, as well as the first, has no years attached; the other four yield an aggregate of 125 years, (20, 14, 40, and 1, respectively.) The Tablet of Abydos gives an additional name between the first and second, and the Tablet of Sakkárah omits the last two names altogether.

*Seventh Dynasty.*—Here a new era and system of designation evidently begin, far less details being given in the lists generally. Manetho (*i. e.*, Africanus, as reported by Syncellus) merely states that this dynasty comprised "70 Memphite kings, who reigned 70 days," (years;) Eusebius: "5 Memphite

kings, who reigned 75 days" (Armen., years.) The Turin Papyrus is the only monumental evidence of their existence;* it gives, as the second section of its third dynasty, 11 names only, (the fourth and the last two illegible,) and appends regnal years to the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth only, with an aggregate of 9 years for these four, (2, 4, 2, and 1, severally.)

*Eighth Dynasty.*—Here Manetho is equally laconic: "28 Memphite kings—146 years;" Eusebius: "5 [Armen., 9] Memphite kings—100 years." The Turin Papyrus has been thought to supply this void by its fourth dynasty, which is in two divisions. The first division has 9 names, the first, second, and sixth illegible; the second division has 5 names, the first and fifth undecipherable, besides space (in the *lacunæ*) apparently for four more at the end. No regnal years are appended to any of the names. The Tablet of Abydos has 16 names, which tolerably correspond.

*Ninth Dynasty.*—Manetho merely gives "19 Heracleopolitan kings—409 years, the first Achthoës;" Eusebius: "Achthoës and 3 successors—100 years." The Turin Papyrus has in its fifth dynasty apparently 6 names, the third and fourth illegible, and no years given. The last two of these correspond with names next given by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, and the first four names are apparently those mentioned in detached inscriptions.

*Tenth Dynasty.*—Manetho has merely "19 Heracleopolitan kings—185 years." The monuments afford no light here.

*Eleventh Dynasty.*—Manetho: "16 Diospolitan kings—43 years; after whom Amemenes—16 years." The later chronographer adds, "altogether 192 kings, 2,300 years," which is

* "The seventh and following dynasties occupy all the second tier, [of the New Tablet of Abydos,] that is, 38 cartouches, including that of Sethos, which ends the list. Of these 38 cartouches, the first immediately follows the sixth dynasty, and the nineteenth belongs to a king, already well known, of the eleventh. From No. 39 to No. 57 are the rows of the 18 kings of the table which are placed between the royal families that I am about to name. But are these 18 kings Memphites, (seventh and eighth dynasties,) or Heracleopolitans (ninth and tenth)? Nobody knows. We, nevertheless, note this fact. On the left and right walls of the passage Phtah is the principal deity. The 130 gods follow him on one side, as the 76 kings follow him on the other. Are we to conclude from this that the royal personages associated in the worship of that god of Memphis are rather Memphite kings? It will be difficult to answer."—Mariette, in the *Revue Archéologique*, ut sup., pp. 16, 17.

evidently only his own summary. The total thus far, however, according to his own list is 202 kings, 2,352 years; according to Eusebius, 129 kings, 2,126 years. The three monumental lists ignore this dynasty altogether, except the last name, to which, however, the Turin Papyrus assigns no years. But we have light from unexpected quarters. Eratosthenes gives us here 9 kings, with an aggregate of 166 years, (22, 12, 8, 18, 7, 12, 11, 60, and [apparently] 16, respectively;) and the Tablet of the Karnak "Hall of Ancestors" mentions three of these and five others earlier.

*Twelfth Dynasty*, (*Diospolitan.*)—Here the full form of designation is resumed, and the monuments are likewise fuller. Manetho gives 7 names (the last a queen) in this dynasty, with an aggregate of 160, (Eusebius, 245,) but by count 182 years, (46, 38, 48, [or 58,] 8, 8, [or 43,] 8, and 4 respectively.) The Turin Papyrus begins its sixth dynasty with the last king of the preceding dynasty, (whom the Tablet of Abydos omits,) but does not give his years; to the remaining 7 reigns it assigns an aggregate of 168 years, (46, 20, 19, 30, 40, [probably in part associate,] 9, and 4, severally.) The Tablet of Abydos omits the last name.

*Thirteenth Dynasty.*—Here Manetho epitomizes again: "60 Diospolitan kings—453 years." They are all ignored by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, but some of them seem to be mentioned in detached inscriptions. The Turin Papyrus, however, is thought to represent them by its seventh dynasty, which it divides into three sections. The first section embraces 21 names, with an aggregate of 106 years assigned to 9 of them; the second has apparently 7 names, with an aggregate of 27 years attributed to 3 of them; and the third section comprehends 32 names, (some illegible,) with an aggregate of 133 appended to 10 of them. As the aggregate number of reigns in these three sections is exactly 60, we may assume that they correctly represent the entire dynasty of Manetho, and that the monumental total of 266 years is correct, instead of his 453.

*Fourteenth Dynasty.*—Manetho is terse again: "76 Xoite kings—184 [Eusebius, 484; Armen., 434] years." Once more the Turin Papyrus, in the absence of all other monumental records of this dynasty, has been thought to come to the rescue,

with its eighth dynasty, which it divides into five sections. The first section includes 21 kings, having 20 years assigned to 11 of them; the second, 24 kings, and 1 year each to 2 of them; the third, 3 names, almost illegible, with no years given; the fourth, 22 names, greatly mutilated, and having no years attached; the fifth, 6 names, much defaced, with no years.

*Fifteenth Dynasty*, (*Shepherd invaders.*)—Here great confusion occurs in the different recensions of Manetho. Syncellus asserts that Eusebius arbitrarily transposed this dynasty into the seventeenth. As this question is complicated by the disputed connection with the Hycsos—a point which is historical rather than chronological, and would lead us, if pursued at this stage, into a tedious side discussion, (see it handled by Dr. Jarvis, in his own way, as above)—we here pass silently over the mooted points of these three dynasties, reserving them for the sequel. Unfortunately, the monumental lists likewise have a break at this point. The Turin Papyrus, however, by the partial coincidence of certain names appended fragmentarily to its eighth dynasty, together with a few correspondences on detached monuments, seems to confirm the order which we here adopt. There are, then, in this dynasty, according to Manetho, 6 (Eusebius, 4) names, with an aggregate of 284 (Josephus, 260; Eusebius, 103) years, (namely, 19, 44, [or 40,] 61, [36,] 50, and 49, [or 30,] and 61, respectively.) The Turin Papyrus appears to assign to the second, third, and fourth of these an aggregate of 110 years, (30, 40, and 60, severally.)

*Sixteenth Dynasty.*—Manetho again is brief: "Other Shepherd-kings—518 years;" some copies, "18 kings—511 [Latin, 318] years;" Euseb., "5 Theban kings—190 years." Most chronologers, however, understand this aggregate to include the fifteenth, and some likewise the seventeenth, dynasty; and this seems to be the meaning of Josephus, (in the passage cited above,) who repeatedly gives the total years as 511. The Turin Papyrus ends with the fifteenth dynasty, and all the other lists appear to ignore these three dynasties entirely, as might be expected if these were foreign usurpers.

*Seventeenth Dynasty.*—Manetho is still brief: "Other Shepherd-kings, and 43 Theban Diospolites; and the Shepherds and Thebans reigned together 151 [some copies, 221; Euseb., 250] years." What relation these two sets of kings held to each

other, whether contemporaneous or successive, is not clear; but the number of years is evidently excessive. The monuments afford no light here.

*Eighteenth Dynasty.*—Here we reach more definite history. Manetho records, "16 [Euseb., 14] Diospolitan kings, of whom the first was Amoses—18 years." Josephus says, "Tethmosis —25 years," and Eusebius has the same number. This king is doubtless the Aahmes of the monuments, where his twenty-second year is recorded. The second king, according to Manetho, (in all his reporters,) was "Chebron [Chebros]—13 years;" and the third, "Amenophthis [Amenophis]—24 [21, or 20½] years." The monuments, however, all give Amenhotp I. as the second king of this dynasty, who evidently corresponds to Manetho's third name. His fourth is, "Amensis—22 years;" Josephus, "Amesis, his sister—21¾ years;" wholly omitted by Eusebius. Manetho's fifth is, "Misaphris—13 years;" Josephus, "Mephres—12¾ years;" Eusebius, "Miphres—12 years." In place of these the monuments all give three of the name of Tautmes successively, namely, Thotmes I., II., and III., who seem to represent Manetho's second, fourth, and fifth names, the queen's reign apparently being merged in the male line. Manetho's sixth name is "Misphragmuthosis—26 years," with which Eusebius and Josephus agree. This is, doubtless, the Amenhotp, or Amenoph II., who appears next in all the monuments. The sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth, as all agree, are respectively Amenoph II.—26 years; Thotmes IV.—9 years; Amenoph III.—31 years, (but the monuments record his thirty-sixth;) and Horus—37 years. The tenth of Manetho is, "Achenes—32 years;" Eusebius, "Acencheres—16 years;" Josephus, "His daughter Acencheres —12 years." The eleventh is, "Rathos—6 years;" Eusebius omits; Josephus, "Her brother Rathotis—9 years." The twelfth is, "Chebres—12 years;" Eusebius, "Cherres—15 years;" Josephus, "Acencheres—12 years, 5 months." The thirteenth is, "Acherres—12 years;" Eusebius omits; Josephus, "Another Acencheres—12 years, 3 months." The fourteenth is, "Aimesses—5 years;" Eusebius, "Armais—5 years;" Josephus, "Armais—4 years, 1 month." All these are ignored by the Tablets of Abydos and Sakkárah, but some of them have slight resemblances to names found on detached inscriptions. The internal and external evidence is very doubtful, unless, as Wilkinson

conjectures, they represent the foreigners (not Shepherds) who usurped the throne for an interval at this time, and whose dominion is silently included in the reign of Horus. The fifteenth and sixteenth named in Manetho seem properly to belong to the succeeding dynasty. The first of these, "Rhammeses—1 year;" Eusebius, "Rhamesses—68 years;" Josephus, "Rhamesses—1 year, 4 months," is evidently the Rameses I. of the monuments, who appears to have founded the dynasty, and yet to have reigned but one or two years. The last name is "Amenophath — 19 years;" Eusebius, "Amenophis — 40 years;" Josephus, "Amenophis — 19½ years," doubtless the Menephtah I. of the monuments, which show, however, that he was the fourth in the following dynasty. Josephus has by some strange confusion introduced before him "Armesses Miammoun—60 years, 2 months."

*Nineteenth Dynasty.* — Here Manetho says, "7 [Euseb., 5, but Manetho gives only 6 names] Diospolitan kings." The first is "Sethos [Josephus, Sethosis]—51 [Eusebius, 55; Josephus, 59] years," evidently the Sethi I., given by all the monuments as the successor of Rameses I. The second is, "Rhapsaces [Eusebius, Rhampses; Josephus, Rhamesses]—61 [Euseb. and Joseph., 66] years," the Rameses II. of the monuments. Next should come in the Menephtah I., noticed above, although the Tablet of Abydos omits him. The Tablet of Sakkárah ends with Selthi I. Certain obscure monumental notices appear at this time of a Sethi II. and a Sethi III., but their reigns must have been very short and unimportant. The third of Manetho is "Ammenephthos—20 [Euseb., 40] years," the Menephtah II. of the monuments, also ignored by the Tablet of Abydos. The fourth of Manetho is "Rhamesses—60 years," omitted by Eusebius; the Ramesses III. of the monuments, with whom the Tablet of Sakkárah closes, and whose highest monumental year is his thirty-first. Manetho's fifth and sixth names are, "Ammenemnes—5 [Euseb., 26] years," and "Thuoris—7 years;" of whom the monuments present but slight, if any, traces.

*Twentieth Dynasty.*—Manetho once more becomes laconic: "12 Diospolitan kings—135 [Euseb., 178; Armen., 172] years." The first 8 probably correspond to the Rameses IV. to XI. of the monuments, and the names, and even the existence, of the

rest are uncertain. Their reigns were all unimportant, and apparently of short duration. The first four were sons consecutively of Rameses III. Wilkinson estimates 21 years for their total reigns.

*Twenty-first Dynasty.* — Manetho here says, "7 Tanite kings," and gives them as follows: "Smendes—26 years; Psusennes—46 [Euseb., 41] years; Nephelcheres—4 years; Amenopthis—9 years; Osorchon—6 years; Psinaches—9 years; Psusennes—14 [Euseb., 35] years." Other copies have 6 names only: "Susacin—34; Psuenos—25; Amenophes—9; Nephecheres—6; Saïtes—15; Psinaches—9." These yield a total of 108 to 130 years.

*Twenty-second Dynasty*, (*Bubastites.*)—This opens with Sesonchis, to whom Manetho assigns 21 years. He is the Sheshonk I. of the monuments, which give the twenty-first as his highest year. It was he who, in the fifth year of Rehoboam, (B. C. 969,) invaded Judea, (2 Chron. xii, 2.) This expedition is recorded in Sheshonk's monumental annals, and is thought to have occurred near the close of his reign, as he was for a considerable period contemporary with Solomon. (1 Kings xi, 40.) This gives us the first definite synchronism of Egyptian with biblical chronology. It is a conclusive comment upon the former that, with all its vaunted certainty, we are at last obliged to fall back upon the latter for its verification. Having thus arrived at a positive point in our researches, we need not continue them any farther. We should find the remainder of Manetho's dynasties as defective and untrustworthy as the preceding, and we should meet with about the same lack of data on the monuments for correcting and supplementing them.

Nor must we be deluded into too implicit a reliance upon the monuments themselves. In some instances they are certainly incorrect. For example: a *stela* of Amunemhet II. (Manetho's Amenemes, of the twelfth dynasty) has been found, recording his twenty-eighth year, although the Turin Papyrus gives him only 20 (Manetho, more correctly, 38) years; and still others of his thirty-fifth and forty-fourth years. So of Amunemhet III., of the same line, a *stela* of the forty-fourth year has been found, though the Turin Papyrus gives him but 40 years, (Manetho, again more correctly, 43 in one recension.) There are not

infrequent evidences of the obliteration and corruption of inscriptions by later and hostile kings, as well as of their suppression of a name and reign by their incorporation into those of a more favorite monarch. The omission of many individual names, and even of whole dynasties in one royal list, which nevertheless appear in another, as often noticed above, may have been due to some such cause; but, whatever the motive, the fact greatly abates our confidence in the record for chronological purposes.

The lists of Manetho, on the other hand, while they must ever furnish the basis of Egyptian history, and of chronology likewise, such as it is, must, nevertheless, be admitted by all candid inquirers, in view of the foregoing comparison and analysis, to be very far from the necessary requirements of exact science. Any book-keeper in whose accounts a tithe of such discrepancies should be detected would be summarily dismissed by his employer. An almanac that should rest its calculations upon such a precarious basis would find few purchasers. Ought a chronologer whose dates are made up of such a series of conjectures, balancing of disagreements, and eking out of deficiencies, to be treated with any greater regard? When Egyptologers, under the guise of science, ask us to cast aside the distinct, straightforward, and connected line of biblical chronology for such a mass of *guesses*, we beg to be excused. The demand only exposes an egregious lack of critical capacity.

Some of the causes of this untrustworthy condition of Manetho's numbers are obvious, such as the natural corruption by transmission through other languages and by careless copyists. But this is not sufficient to account for the extent of the contradiction even between the different recensions, much less their wide variance from the monumental records. They must have been *purposely* altered. We have seen that in one instance Syncellus directly charges upon Eusebius a willful change of his authority. The fact appears to be that they all tinkered the chronology to suit their various favorite systems. A modern scholar, who has closely investigated the subject, even insists that the entire scheme of Manetho, at least as it has come down to us, has been fashioned for *cyclical* purposes, and he adduces striking evidences of that view, (Browne, in Arnold's

"Theological Critic," 1851–52.) This we should naturally expect from the temper of the age when the authors lived whose works have alone preserved to us the fragments and compends of Manetho. But, whatever was their purpose, they certainly have so modified and entangled Manetho's numbers that no human ingenuity can now unravel them with certainty. All that learning and research can justly claim is to adjust *conjecturally* their intricacies, errors, and defects.

## Art. II.—OUR SOUTHERN FIELD.

The abolition of slavery places the two sections of our country, the North and the South, in much better relations to each other than previously existed. Future peace, harmony, and unity are now possible, and highly probable, in our nation. This change has deeply affected Episcopal Methodism in its different branches, in all sections of the Union, and among both races of our people. If slavery be considered the cause, or the occasion, of the separation of 1844, the conclusion is the same, namely, that this alone divided the Methodist Episcopal Church. Whether it shall be again united in one body or not is for the future to determine; but that all branches of Methodism may continue to live and grow side by side, in peace and fraternal accord, cannot be successfully denied. The precepts of the Gospel require love among brethren. If they be Christians they must be fraternal, though in different organizations.

Methodism spread rapidly in the South at an early day, and in 1844 there was, probably, more of wealth and culture among Methodists in the Southern States than in the same denomination in the North. But since that time the Methodist Episcopal Church has moved forward with marvelous rapidity in the acquisition of wealth, culture, social position, and popular influence, as well as in numbers and usefulness; while the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has not held the foreground which it assumed, and which was granted to it, at the time of its organization. It may be conceded that it has maintained itself strongly in the South, but certainly it has not advanced in these respects so rapidly as the Northern people or as the

Methodist Episcopal Church has done. These are points which should be kept in mind in studying the present status of either Church, or the relations of the two to each other.

Our Southern field, geographically considered, is large, embracing all of the late slave States; for, though a portion of this territory adhered to the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844, and has always been included in that connection, it was, and is now, claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Long-continued efforts have been made to wrest it from us, and we have been compelled to practically, if not nominally, reorganize in nearly all of it since the war. The conferences which originally formed the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were the Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Memphis, Tennessee, Holston, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, with a Church membership of 439,233. The State of Delaware and the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia were embraced in the Philadelphia Conference, a large part of Maryland and Virginia in the Baltimore, and the remainder of Maryland and West Virginia in the Pittsburgh and Ohio Conferences.

The line between the seceding and the adhering conferences in 1844 was as follows: Beginning on the Chesapeake Bay at the mouth of the Rappahannock River; thence up that stream, westward to the Blue Ridge; thence southward along the ridge to a point south of the railroad from Lynchburgh to Bristol, so as to include Salem and Christiansburgh in the Baltimore Conference; thence to the New River, and down that stream to the line now forming the boundary of the State of West Virginia, and across to the Big Sandy on the Kentucky line, and down that river to the Ohio; down the Ohio to the Mississippi, and up the Mississippi to the north line of Missouri, and west along that line to the western boundary of that State. This is the northern line of the Southern Church, conditionally agreed to in the so-called "Plan of Separation," according to the terms of which it had no rights north of this boundary. By that document, however, the Methodist Episcopal Church had a right to claim all societies, stations, and conferences on the border south of this line which should, by a majority vote, decide to adhere to it.

Across this line to the southward the Methodist Episcopal

Church from 1844 to 1848 did not propose to go, unless it was to minister to such societies as voted to adhere to it, as provided in the report of the Committee of Nine. On the contrary, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, using all of the means in its power, proper and improper, passed over this border to the north, and sought to occupy all of the territory in the slave States, and some in the free as well, in the most flagrant violation of the provisions of the report called by the Southern Church the "Plan of Separation," and for which it now professes such ardent love. The Virginia Conference crossed the Chesapeake Bay to the Eastern Shore, and sought to break up societies and circuits in the Philadelphia Conference, also the Rappahannock to the north, and the Blue Ridge to the west, into the Valley of Virginia, in the Baltimore Conference, disaffecting societies and seizing churches without respect to the "border." The Kentucky Conference crossed the line to the east into West Virginia, then in the Ohio Conference, and made most extraordinary efforts to break up our work there, and to drive the Methodist Episcopal Church from the country. Nothing in the history of mankind is more certain than that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, determined to occupy all of the slave territory, and exclude the Methodist Episcopal Church therefrom. It organized a conference in California in 1852, and made a vigorous effort in Kansas in the early settlement of that State, in the expectation that slavery would be established there in violation of a most solemn compact.

The idea of holding all of this slave territory has never been relinquished by the southern Church. In 1861 the Virginia portion of the Baltimore Conference met in Staunton, most of the members from Maryland being absent because of the breaking out of the Rebellion, and, in a kind of outside convention, voted the whole conference, with the membership and Church property, out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, intending to transfer all, in opposition to a majority of the preachers and members, to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at the General Conference to be held in New Orleans in 1862. The General Conference, however, did not meet till 1866. Then this faction, having become an independent Baltimore Conference, united with the southern Church, and

claimed to transfer to that body every thing originally belonging to the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was done with the knowledge, approval, and concurrent action of the New Orleans General Conference, in 1866, since the war, and the territory is still claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It is, therefore, plain that, in considering our southern work, this long-disputed ground should be taken into account. Our southern field, then, extends from Delaware to Mexico, along the old border of freedom from the Atlantic across the Mississippi Valley to the western line of Missouri, down the Atlantic coast to the Florida Keys, and along the Gulf of Mexico to the Rio Grande, embracing sixteen States, nearly one half of all of the organized States of the Union, ten of which are larger than Ohio, and all averaging one third more in area, having an aggregate of 890,972 square miles, with a population of 13,877,612 in 1870.

Financially, the South is poor, and in comparison with the North, very poor. The aggregate wealth of these sixteen States, as given by the census report of 1870, from which these statistics on financial and educational questions are taken, is $5,559,522,132, while that of New York alone is $6,500,841,264, nearly a thousand millions more than the wealth of the entire South. The wealth of Pennsylvania is $3,808,340,112, these two States having nearly twice as much property as all of the South. Over one half of the wealth of the South lies along the old border of freedom, mostly in the States of Missouri, with $1,284,922,897; Kentucky, $604,318,532; Maryland, $643,784,976: total of these States, $2,533,026,425. Ohio has nearly as much wealth as these three put together, namely, $2,235,430,300. Add West Virginia, $190,651,491, and the District of Columbia, $126,873,618, and the aggregate on the border is, $2,850,451,534, over one half of the wealth of the South. Tennessee has $498,237,724. Illinois has $2,121,680,579, nearly as much as all of the cotton, sugar, and rice producing States combined, namely, Virginia, $409,588,133; North Carolina, $260,757,244; South Carolina, $208,146,989; Florida, $44,163,655; Georgia, $268,169,207; Alabama, $201,855,841; Mississippi, $209,197,345; Louisiana, $323,125,666; Texas, $159,052,542; and Arkansas, $156,394,691; aggregating, $2,240,451,313; but little

more, as already observed, than Illinois, or than either Massachusetts or Ohio. Other comparisons fully as striking might be made.

Here is food for reflection. Why this wide difference in the temporal condition of these sections of our common country? Why the poverty of the one and the prosperity of the other? This question has an important bearing upon our southern work. If the South is naturally and necessarily poor, the hope of large returns for our expenditures in this field is not flattering. But there is nothing discouraging for the future in these startling facts. The South need not remain poor. Its resources are abundant. The country is not ruined by the war. By far the greatest financial loss attributed to this cause is by the emancipation of the slaves, which numbered in 1860 3,953,760, and are estimated in the South at a valuation of $4,000,000,000, or over $1,000 each. But this sum is less than two thirds of the valuation of New York, and but little more than that of Pennsylvania. Nor is the poverty of the South due to the soil of this section. Every thing can be raised to advantage here that is produced in the North, and cotton, sugar, and rice, besides. The cotton crop in 1860 amounted to 5,387,052 bales of four hundred pounds each, worth at least ten cents a pound, $215,482,080. Since the war the average product has been greater than before. In the past twelve years, beginning with 1865, 2,000,000 bales more have been raised than during the twelve years preceding 1861, and much more than at any other time previous. In that year, 1860, 187,167,032 pounds of rice and 230,982 hogsheads of sugar were produced on southern plantations. The rice and sugar interests have not recovered their former proportions for manifest reasons. In the matter of raising home supplies there has been great improvement in later years in most of the States, and there is no room for doubt that if our laboring force, white and colored, were stimulated to reasonable activity by a hope of fair compensation, all necessary provisions for the plantation could be raised, and as much rice and sugar annually as in 1860, and seven or eight millions of bales of cotton in addition. The time is not distant when even greater results than these may be realized by improvement of the soil, better methods of cultivation, and more intelligent and increased in-

dustry, if justice be done and peace maintained. Add to these the products of the mines, with which the country abounds, and of manufactures, which are rapidly increasing, and it is seen that the resources of the South are almost without limit. Perhaps there is no country on the globe of equal extent having greater natural advantages. The climate is mild, and yet remarkably healthful, affording the best possible opportunities to the husbandman and other laborers. The hills of the center and plains of the coast in future ages will teem with tens of millions of people. The whites are of Saxon blood, and if they differ materially from the population of the North, it is because they have been placed in different circumstances.

Why, then, the poverty of the South? Slavery is the cause. This institution turned European immigration, the best the world ever produced for peopling a new country, largely from the South to the North, and also drove thousands of our best native population across the Ohio River and to the West, to escape its baneful influence. Immigration brought to the North, year by year, brain, muscle, and money to aid in developing the country, while the South wastefully and wickedly poured out its millions to purchase men to till its lands and build its cities. When a slave died the money invested in him was lost; and thus every generation sunk and annihilated hundreds, and in late years thousands of millions of dollars, which, under free institutions, would have gone into improvements, and helped to swell the wealth of the nation. The free immigration of the North and the purchase of laborers for the South go far toward solving the question under discussion. Again, slavery was degrading, necessarily so, and the idea of this degradation inevitably passed from the slave to all branches of manual labor. Work was shunned because workmen were despised. Instead of promoting industry, slavery was its greatest enemy and hinderance, for, while it overtaxed the bondman, it discouraged, depressed, and almost destroyed free labor; and as two thirds of the population were free, the loss during the last hundred years through the inactivity of large numbers of white people has been immense. The slave system, also, impoverished the lands. In all civilized countries, the South alone excepted, the older the country the more valuable the soil. Not so here. A few years of cultivation, not

enough even to bring it into good tilth under the old system, left the surface exhausted and wasted, and, for the want of better culture, large tracts were thrown out as waste and worthless. Slavery has made the South poor, and not a barren soil, an unfavorable climate, or an indolent and improvident people. A century of freedom, peace, and enterprise, directed by intelligence, will make the South the pride of America, the admired of all lands, the garden of the world. The ministers and teachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church are not toiling in vain in these States.

The educational condition of the South is deplorable, and always has been. It has its statesmen, scholars, literary men and women, of whom it may be proud, but the mass of the people have been left, by them and by the Churches, in ignorance. The slaves were prevented from learning by design; had they been educated they would have found a way out of bondage. To hold them in slavery it was necessary to keep them in darkness. For this reason it was made a crime, punishable by law, in most of the States, to teach a slave a knowledge of letters. The poor white people were permitted to remain in a similar condition for a like purpose, to protect the peculiar institution. There were always in the South thousands who regarded slavery as an evil, and who thought it a Christian duty to instruct the ignorant; and if schools had been established for the benefit of the white people generally the colored would have found friends among them who would have taught them to read in disregard of the law, and thus slavery would have been undermined. For the same reason manufacturing was but little encouraged in the South before the war. Profits were as much desired then as now, and abundant openings might have been found for various enterprises of that kind; but manufacturing called for skilled laborers, and these would have demanded schools, and education would have endangered slavery, and this was sustained and guarded at all hazards. An ignorant people might be controlled by a designing aristocracy, but an enlightened community would become independent, or, at least, restive, under self-constituted leaders. Slavery kept the South in ignorance.

One half of the adult population of the South in 1870 was illiterate. At that time there were 5,658,144 persons in the

United States, over ten years of age, who could not write: 4,880,271 were native-born, and 4,091,089 of these were in the South, leaving only 1,567,055 illiterates in the North, most of whom were foreigners, or of foreign descent. For example: Massachusetts had 97,742 illiterates over ten years of age, 89,830 of whom were foreign-born, and of the remaining 7,912 one half were born of foreign parents, less than 4,000 in a native white population of 1,090,085, or one in 270; while Alabama had 91,219 native white adults who could not write, in a native white population of 511,520, or one in 5½, Georgia had 110,849 native white adults in the same condition, in a native white population of 627,799, or one in 5¼, and North Carolina 166,280 in a native white population of 675,442, or one in 4. Virginia had 445,897 illiterates, or 57 per cent. of the population, over ten years of age; North Carolina, 397,690, or 51 per cent.; South Carolina, 290,374, or 57 per cent.; Florida, 71,803, or 54 per ct.; Georgia, 468,593, or 56 per ct.; Alabama, 383,012, or 54 per ct.; Mississippi, 313,310, or 53 per cent.; Louisiana, 276,158, or 52 per cent.; the number of illiterates in the entire South, over ten years old, white and colored, native and foreign, being 4,161,203, which is nearly one half of the population of that age, and fully one half of those over fifteen years. But these figures do not tell the whole truth touching this matter. There is yet a darker shade to this sad and humiliating picture. It is this: thousands may spell out words and write their names, and thus be classed with those who read and write, who cannot peruse a newspaper or the Bible intelligently. This is particularly true where the standard of learning is so low as in the South, and where illiteracy is not discreditable. It is painful to make the admission, but it is, nevertheless, true, as is apparent from the foregoing facts, that, deductions being made for children, these statistics will show that in some of the Southern States not one half of the native white population can read the word of God so as to readily apprehend its meaning. Twelve thousand white families in Alabama are destitute of the Bible. This is the fruit of slavery.

The South has numerous Churches, orthodox and evangelical in belief. The Baptist Year-Book for 1876 gives the number of that order in the South at 1,269,388, of whom the colored Baptists claim 600,000, but of these candor extorts the

remark that they are greatly lacking in organization, intelligence, and morals. The Southern Presbyterian Church, according to the latest statistics, has 112,000 communicants; the Cumberland Presbyterian about the same, though only 100,000 in the South; the Lutherans possibly as many, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has 67,928 in the Southern States, according to the Church Almanac of 1878. The Congregationalists have a number of organizations formed since the war, and are accomplishing much good, especially through the schools of the American Missionary Association. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has 715,951 white members; 2,083 colored members; 4,315 Indians; 3,271 traveling, 259 superannuated, and 5,462 local preachers; total, 731,361. In 1844 it organized with 439,233 members and 1,251 preachers; total, 440,484; and in a short time wrested several thousand more from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1860 it had 749,068 members, and 2,884 preachers; total, 751,952; loss in sixteen years, from 1860 to 1876, 20,591. It had in 1860 175,252 colored members, and has now but 2,083. The gain in white members and preachers during these sixteen years has been 148,243, an average of 9,265 a year. The African Methodist Episcopal Church has, perhaps, 180,000; the Zion Methodist Episcopal Church, 120,000; and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America, 80,000 in the South, though the last three are, doubtless, over-estimated. Allow to the Methodist Protestant 50,000. All other evangelical Churches in the South are small in numbers and feeble in influence except the Methodist Episcopal Church. Giving these denominations all they claim by the largest reasonable estimates, there are not over 2,800,000 nominal communicants in Protestant Churches, not including our own, in the South. Supposing two additional adherents, for small children and outside friends, to one member, as many as facts will justify, they embrace only 8,400,000 in a population of 13,877,612, leaving five and a half millions without the Gospel, except as they receive it at the hand of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This is as good showing for the South as can be reasonably made. The practical work and efficiency of a Church is in part indicated by its Sunday-schools. Tried by this standard the condition of the South is appalling. The million and a quarter

of Baptists only claim to have 220,000 in Sunday-schools. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has 346,759; these two leading denominations, with two millions of members, having but a trifle over half a million in their Sunday-schools. Outside of the Methodist Episcopal Church there are not a million persons even enrolled in Protestant Sunday-schools in the South, not an average of one in thirteen of the population. It is evident that there is ample room for the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South in addition to all the other Protestant forces in this section.

The Churches of the South, as a whole, are lacking in moral strength. The people are generally orthodox in sentiment, believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the atonement, and in salvation from sin by faith in Christ alone. There is less skepticism in the public mind in the South than in the North. The first table of the law touching man's relations and obligations to God has been well maintained by the religious press and the pulpit, but the Bible view of man's duty to man has been greatly overlooked by both ministers and Churches. The morality of the Gospel has been sadly neglected in precept and practice. The pulpit has been orthodox in its teaching of the theory of religion, so far as it has gone, but weak in enforcing the divine precepts touching practical questions of right and wrong.

The colored people, especially, need our assistance. They number five millions, most of whom are children of want, who have been providentially placed at our doors. They were brought to this country when in the ignorance, poverty, and wretchedness of barbarism, and here they have been held in the lowest relation known to mankind—slavery. When liberated, they were without preparation for freedom, without education, without lands, without homes, without families, without bread for a day, or clothing to cover their nakedness. Since emancipation, they have been preyed upon by the avaricious, and led astray by the corrupt. Like the man on the way from Jerusalem to Jericho, they have fallen among thieves, been waylaid, beaten, and left bleeding and half dead, while scarcely a Samaritan hand has been extended to bind up their wounds or alleviate their distresses. And yet they have kept the peace and struggled upward. They are

rising to manhood, and cultivating a better social and Christian life. That they have done so well is the wonder of our times. God is with them; he pities them, and will care for them. For the Church to cast them off would be folly and sin. Of this there is no thought, but to help them to help themselves should be the aim and ambition of every Christian and philanthropist in the land. There are also thousands of whites as much neglected by the more favored classes as these, and whose condition calls for as deep sympathy and active co-operation. Surely no one will say that there is no need of this, or any other branch of the Church which is able to lend a hand in aid of these lowly and unfortunate classes.

The welfare of the country requires that all of these be taught in the duties of Christian citizenship in a free country. They vote, and otherwise take part in the affairs of State. Upon their action may depend the most momentous results. If intelligent, they may act independently and wisely; if ignorant, they may fall a prey to demagogues, and, by misapprehension of duty, bring shame and ruin upon the country. They will be a source of danger or of security; they will add strength or weakness to the nation as they are enlightened or neglected. There is more to be feared from the five and a half millions of illiterate citizens of the United States than from any other equal number of our people, because of the ease with which they may be misled in times of peril. The vicious are always suspected and watched, but an ignorant population may, at any time, prove a broken reed, piercing the hand that leans upon it. Important events in our history, well calculated to arouse the thoughtless and to alarm even the most hopeful, have only been made possible by the ignorance of the multitudes. Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people; but there is little hope for better morals without more intelligence among the masses. In our country the people are sovereign, and an ignorant and corrupt ruler is a public calamity. Shall not the strongest Church in America continue to do something in the darkest corner of our land for its future safety and well being?

The General Conference of 1848 determined to reoccupy the South, as Providence should open the way. The error of 1844 was acknowledged, and as the Southern Church had vio-

lated the conditions of the arrangement on which it professedly based its organization as a separate body, that enactment, even had it otherwise been valid, was annulled, and the Methodist Episcopal Church felt free to enter southern territory wherever an opportunity was found. The West Virginia and Missouri Conferences were formed during that year, afterward the Kentucky and the Arkansas. But such was the bitterness of the pro-slavery spirit that but little progress was made before the war, and the work was greatly distracted, and in many places broken up, in the early years of the Rebellion, so that in 1862 the Minutes reported only 4,940 members on the territory that seceded in 1844. Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia were also thrown into confusion. More than two hundred churches, of which we had peaceable possession from the time they were built, and to which the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had not a shadow of title, were seized, and every thing was done that was possible to force the Methodist Episcopal Church out of all the States where slavery was tolerated. Had the Rebellion succeeded, this would have been done. But as the armies of the Union advanced southward the people, white and colored, called for the ministry of the Church of their fathers. It spread from State to State, and has been reorganized in all parts of the South.

On the slave territory of 1860 the Methodist Episcopal Church now has 27 annual conferences, 400,000 Church members, 2,103 traveling and 4,030 local preachers, 223,254 Sunday-school scholars, 34,890 teachers, over nine millions of dollars in Church property, numerous institutions of learning, and every thing requisite to the development of a strong and growing Church. The work has been marvelous in the rapidity and healthfulness of its growth, and the readiness with which it has been consolidated and unified into a homogeneous and aggressive body. This is the more extraordinary from the fact that it is made up, almost exactly, of equal numbers of white and colored people. Had any one predicted ten years ago that the results now accomplished would have been realized at this time, he would have been thought an enthusiast. But these numbers have not been gathered by means of a time-serving policy in lowering the standard of morals to suit circumstances or the inclinations of the worldly, or by

yielding to prejudice against the National Government, or the people of the North, but by faithful Christian work. Methodism never had more fearless defenders of its faith and principles than in this field. They are outspoken in behalf of national unity, the rights of man, and equality before the law and in the Christian Church, and also on the evils of intemperance, social corruption, the desecration of the Sabbath, and all others which afflict mankind and threaten the welfare of the country, as is no other pulpit in the South. They are universally in favor of the education of all classes, and of Christian unity, peace, and fraternal love among all evangelical Churches.

The two hundred thousand white members in this field are found mostly along the border in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, where, in many places they constitute by far the strongest denomination in the section, and form a base to our Southern work of the most reliable and favorable character. The influence of the Churches in Baltimore, Washington, Covington, Louisville, and St. Louis, is felt throughout the South. South of these States the white work is not so strong, but it is aggressive and full of hope. The Central Tennessee Conference is composed of this class, the white, as is most of the Holston; also the Georgia, the Alabama, the Austin Conference in Texas, and the Southern German Conference. There is, also, a considerable sprinkling of white members in the Carolinas, Florida, and Louisiana. The educational work has not been forgotten by these members. With but little aid from the North, they have established the East Tennessee Wesleyan University, Tullahoma College, Central Tennessee Conference Seminary, Dixon Seminary, Holston Seminary, in Tennessee; Candler College, in North Carolina; Ellijay Seminary, in Georgia; and Andrews Institute, in Alabama; all of which are doing excellent service in their several locations and spheres. Their ministers, on an average, are fully equal to those of other denominations in like circumstances, and in intelligence and social position the membership has reason for gratitude, and compares favorably with other Churches.

If possible, the work among the colored people is still more remarkable. They number, also, two hundred thousand mem-

bers, and are well organized throughout the South. Assisted by the Freedmen's Aid Society, schools of high grade are established among them at Nashville, Atlanta, Orangeburgh, Jacksonville, Huntsville, Holly Springs, New Orleans, and in Texas, and seminaries at Dadeville, La Grange, Waynesborough, and Greensborough, a theological institute in Baltimore, and local schools at numerous other places. From these not less than a thousand young men and women are now going forth annually to teach in the public schools among their people, having not less than fifty thousand students under their instruction. What a work is this to spring as from the dust in so short a time! A few years more, and it will reach the millions. The Methodist Episcopal Church is the strongest moral force among this people. They are girding themselves for the final conflict with Satan, for the mastery of the globe. All of the appliances of the Church have been brought into requisition in the prosecution of the Southern mission. The itinerancy, episcopal supervision, the Missionary Society, Board of Church Extension, Sunday-School Union, Book Concern, Board of Education, and Tract Society, have all been permitted to share in the burdens, and will reap of the harvests in this field.

Some in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have recently, in the papers of that denomination, urged the importance of requiring the Methodist Episcopal Church to withdraw from the South, disbanding its forces here, or turning them over to other organizations, as the price of the fraternal favor of that body. Such a preposterous suggestion cannot be entertained for a moment. The Providence which placed us there has yet a greater work for us in reserve. The idea that two friendly branches of the Church of Christ cannot abide peaceably in the same section of country is absurd. God has given to these missions such success as seldom, if ever, attended his ministers in the same time under like circumstances, and to leave the vineyard now would be a crime of fearful magnitude. At the time of the division the Methodist Episcopal Church had left to it 632,123 members. It has advanced to the number of 1,673,287 members, and 23,839 preachers; total, 1,697,126; increase, one million; teachers and scholars in Sunday-school, 1,706,557; and it raised for benevolence and Church

expenses in 1877, $16,597,850. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, starting at the same time—to repeat in this connection—with 439,233 members, now has 722,346 in its laity; increase, 283,113; 8,992 preachers, 396,556 teachers and scholars in Sunday-school. In view of this record, and of the achievements in the Southern field by the Methodist Episcopal Church, why should it be asked to leave the South, or relax its efforts in this portion of the country? At this time it has in the South nearly two thirds as many members and Sunday-school scholars, over two thirds as many Sunday-school teachers and preachers, as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in all its borders, including the North and the Pacific coast; and it pays into the missionary treasury at least two thirds as much as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, raises for missions, and three times more than that body expends in foreign lands; and it is building more churches than that or any other denomination in the same section.

When it organized in the North, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, must have expected either to overrun the whole country, and constitute the main body of Episcopal Methodism, or that the Methodist Episcopal Church would claim equal rights in the South. It struggled for the mastery in California and Kansas, as already observed, in the early history of those States; and in 1862, Dr. Ditzler, of that denomination, was found in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, endeavoring to unite the enemies of the Government, of Methodist belief, in a body known as the Christian Union, afterward called the Episcopal Methodist Church. Dr. Ditzler appeared at the General Conference in New Orleans, in 1866, with glowing accounts of this movement, claiming four or five thousand members, sixty traveling preachers, and gaining by fifties daily. The Bishops approved of the measure, and commended it in their address, and the General Conference ingrafted it upon the Church, as was originally designed. But now, after the labors of fourteen years, it numbers only 52 traveling, 81 local ministers, and 5,792 members, scattered over the Northwest. The other Conferences of the Southern Church on free territory are still weaker. Within the Denver Annual Conference there are only 21 ministers in all, and 502 members; Los Angelos Conference, 19 traveling ministers, 17 local, and

875 members; Pacific Conference, 59 traveling, 52 local preachers, and 3,728 members; Columbia Conference, 20 traveling, 23 local preachers, and 1,033 members; total of ministers and members, 12,282, and these are distributed from Ohio to the Pacific Ocean. If these persons think that they can be more pious or useful in that communion, it is their right to remain there, and they should do so. Certain it is that hundreds of thousands in the South believe that they can be both more pious and useful in the Methodist Episcopal Church than in any other. Who shall deny them the privilege?

If the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, conditions her withdrawal from the North upon the consent of our Church to divide itself by geographical lines, or to retire from the South, the disinterested love of our Southern brethren in such a proposal is not apparent. That would be a proposition to us to give a well-organized Church of four hundred thousand members and over nine millions of dollars in Church property for these few broken fragments. And if such a measure were possible, neither Church would realize much advantage from it, for the reason that the people are free to choose their Church relations, and but few of our members would, or could consistently, unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and that has but a very small number to join the Methodist Episcopal Church. Nearly half a million of citizens in the South claim the right to be members of our Methodist Episcopal Church; and the sacred cause of religious liberty on American soil is at stake in their case. Only by the most ruthless persecuting violence, whether by popular mobs or by Government despotism, can the rights of such a body of American Christians be destroyed. Besides, terms of "formal" fraternity have been agreed to, which leave each Church free to occupy the whole country untrammeled by the other. The Brooklyn General Conference, in offering fraternal courtesies to the Southern Church, in 1872, stated explicitly that the Methodist Episcopal Church would continue to sustain its work in the South.* The General Conference in Louisville

* Our Church is as really settled in that region as in any part of the land; and every consideration of good faith to our own people, and of regard to the integrity of our Church, and especially of the unmistakable evidences of the favor of God toward our efforts there, forbids the thought of relaxing our labors in that part of

accepted the fraternal delegates sent to it on this condition, and appointed commissioners to arrange terms of "formal" fraternity. An effort in the General Conference to instruct the commissioners failed, and they were left without direction to act on behalf of the Church. Conditions were agreed to which have been almost unanimously approved by the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and which do not limit the territory of either body, but permit each to go forth every-where with the approval of the other. Why draw a geographical line between them now?

Some have suggested that these Southern missions are expensive and burdensome to the Church. The support of the Gospel requires money in all places, and the benevolent have been called upon to aid the needy from the time of the apostles. Christian missions are always considered burdensome by a portion of the Church, whether in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Germany, Italy, India, China, or elsewhere. Shall they, for this reason, be abandoned? If not in those places, why here? These are not more onerous than others. Baltimore and Wilmington Conferences are on slave territory, but they received no appropriations from the missionary treasury in 1876, though they paid to it $37,582. Not taking these into account, we have 740 ministers among the white people of the South, who received from the missionary treasury, in 1876, $29,300, but they paid into the treasury, from collections raised among the people to whom they preached, $10,418, leaving only $18,882 drawn from the Church outside of these Conferences for the support of all our white work in the South for that year, being an average of $251 50 to each preacher. This year they receive less, and will probably raise more missionary money. During the same year there were given to Mexico, $24,000; Japan, $18,000; Italy, $19,200; Germany, $24,000; Scandinavia, $45,600; China, $33,900; and to India, $66,000. None too much in any case,

our work. We must, therefore, continue to occupy that part of the country in perpetuity: and we have need to strengthen and reinforce our work in it, as God shall give us the means and the opportunities. But in all this we desire to avoid all unfriendly rivalries with our brethren of the Church, South. There is abundant room for both us and them, and God may use both of these Churches for the promotion of his cause in those parts.—*Jour., Gen. Conf.*, 1872, pp. 402, 403.

and, doubtless, all of this money was well used; but in comparison with these fields our white work in the South cannot be considered burdensome or expensive. When the whole of the slave territory is included, it is found that the white members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South paid into the missionary treasury of the Church in 1876 $18,700 *more* than was drawn from it for the support of all of our white work in the South for the same year!

The number of preachers among the colored people in 1876 was 1,028, who received in that year $58,500 of missionary money; but they raised from those whom they served, and paid into the treasury, during the same year, $7,937; balance, $50,563; average per minister paid by the Church outside of these conferences, $49. It may be well in this connection to make further comparisons with the Southern Church. It has but one benevolent collection, that is, for missions, and reports no other in the Minutes, except for superannuated preachers. This year it has appropriated for missions, including Church extension, $78,000; namely, for China, $14,250; Mexico, $3,381; Brazil, $1,850; total for foreign missions, $19,481. The remainder is appropriated, some conditionally, some for church building, and the balance to domestic missions. The custom of that denomination has been to require a considerable portion of the appropriations to home missions to be raised on the charges receiving the appropriations, for the support of the ministers on those circuits; that is, a part of the appropriation was not paid unless the money was collected on the circuits receiving it for that purpose. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the South raised for missions, aside from all the other collections, in 1876, $55,937, and in 1877, $57,626, and on the territory that seceded in 1844, $14,186, in 1876, and $16,381, in 1877, which is almost as much as the Church, South, gives to foreign fields. Our people have raised this money in the midst of poverty, opposition, persecution, and bloodshed, of which the North has no conception, and while struggling heroically to build houses of worship, and to support the ministry. Did they enjoy the privileges granted to others, in all parts of the South, these collections would exceed the best efforts of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and if the North were to give for benevolent purposes, of its

ability, according to circumstances, as liberally as these have done, the treasuries of the Church would be overflowing. Again, let it be remembered that for every dollar contributed to this field there are now two dollars in Church property in the conferences on the territory that seceded in 1844.

Such are some of the facts in relation to our Southern field. The statements here given are not overdrawn, but based upon the most reliable authorities. The relative strength of our work is greater, rather than under these representations, for the palpable reasons that the administration of discipline is more strict, and the statistics are much more reliable, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, than in the Baptist, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or either of the African Methodist branches. If their reports of Church members were made as carefully as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, great reductions in numbers would follow, and if members were excluded for misdemeanors, as is expected among us, still further and serious losses would result to those denominations. If the strength of any Church is here underestimated, it is that of our own. The evidence is conclusive that the field is wide and also ripe.

And we repeat that our strength in the South enhances and sustains the strength of every other evangelical influence. Every other evangelical Church is not the weaker, but the stronger for our presence. We come not to destroy, but to build up. We are ready to harmonize and to co-operate with every Protestant Christian body that seeks the spread of Christian holiness. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, may and ought to gather new strength, power, numbers, and prosperity, in brotherhood with us. We offer it not only the fraternal, but the co-operative hand; but whether it accepts or rejects it, our duty and our work are the same. We exist here not by its sufferance. We do not ask its permission. We are Americans, and have a right every-where in our free America. The Church has the same right in the North that we have; we have the same right in the South that it has. And there are so many ties of common history, doctrine, and spirit, that we ought to welcome each other with heart and hand as common workers in the same great field.

What has been done is only the beginning of better things. The design in the Divine mind for America, and for the

world, is manifest, to wit: that the whole earth become the garden of the Lord, filled with righteousness, peace, love, intelligence, joy, and material prosperity. The immediate future of our country to many appears dark and portentous. None but the Divine eye can see what is before us, but He who has watched over our earlier years is still with his people, and will never fail them. It may prove that the defenders of the Union, after having preserved the nation from disruption and ruin, untimely surrendered to opposing principles, and that other struggles are inevitable. But eternity and almightiness are attributes of right, and through the mercy of God the end will be glorious. In any case, a great and effectual door is open before the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, and fearful responsibility attaches to its course in reference to this section. Faithful to its high calling, to its principles, to itself, and, including all, to God, its sowing in tears will be followed by reaping with joy.

## Art. III.—SILENCE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCHES.

*The Silence of Women in the Churches.* By Rev. A. Hastings Ross, Springfield, Ohio. Articles in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," April and October, 1870.

*Women keeping Silence in Churches.* By Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D., Andover, Mass. Article in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1878.

*Woman Preaching Forbidden by Scripture.* By Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, D.D. Contribution to the "New York Independent."

*Shall Women Preach in the Congregation?* By Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D.D. Contribution to the "New York Independent."

*Female Preaching.* Anon. Copy of a letter sent to an absent daughter.

The ideal woman represented in the New Testament is a subject forever beautiful to our thoughts. It is a picture that ever attracts and never wearies in the study. To its contemplation the Christian student turns with an interest that is at once instructive and tireless. Masters of æsthetic art have made themselves immortal by illustrating their own conceptions in Madonnas on canvas and marble; but paintings and statuary never did, and never can, successfully represent the womanhood of the Scriptures. Genius cannot reproduce it in objective forms. It is a thought that cannot be thoroughly

transferred by chisel or brush. Its realization, therefore, must either remain forever subjective as the creation of our own minds, or become exampled in the feminine character molded into the saintly life.

Woman's relations unfold suggestively and significantly to human intelligence. Her history illustrates the strangest combination of abilities and disabilities of character, along with immeasurable susceptibilities and possibilities of being. Before God and man she stands at once in the attitude of affection and silence. Her position of seeming equality with her husband in the original plan and appointment of God; her subsequent subordination, consequent upon the commission of her first sin; her beautiful acceptance of subjection, as imposed in the Divine ruling; her peculiar responsibilities of life, putting in utmost request her loving heart; her womanly qualifications, discoverable in every attribute of her nature; her worth and wealth of love, developed under the severer disciplines of probation; her capabilities of character, disclosed through her intuitions and faith—these are among the things constituting the *memorabilia* of a Christian woman's life.

Whatever nature may unfold touching her position and government in the home, it is yet indispensable to look to the Scriptures to discover any restrictions imposed upon female character or activities in the services of the Church. Strange to say, her attitude in her relation to her husband and her behavior in the sanctuary of God, while the subject of special direction from the apostle, are yet points not quite settled in the sincere convictions of the Christian scholar and critic. Opinions divide and oppose precisely where we should naturally expect a conclusion reached so complete in our understanding as to place the matter beyond all question or recall.

It is not proposed to discuss in this paper the claims of the modern "woman movement" as related to her right of franchise or the demand made that she should be recognized as an ordained minister of Christ. These questions differ from that here contemplated. Rather, it is the purpose to examine the teachings of Scripture—aside from preconceived theory—touching woman's right of speech under the apostle's ruling, or whether she is in fact relegated to a condition of *absolute silence* whenever she engages in the services of the sanctuary.

Two paragraphs from the pen of Paul are relied upon as fundamental to the two opposing theories, each of which claims to represent the doctrine of woman's true position on the question of silence and subordination, as set forth in the New Testament: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." 1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35. "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. ii, 11–14.

If woman was subordinated to man from the moment of her creation, she certainly does not seem to have been subjected to his "rule"* before the fall. Rather, Adam appears to recognize entire equality as existing between himself and Eve when, with an expressed and special reason, he applies to her the very name designating the man, with merely an added sign of feminine gender: אִישׁ, *man*, אִשָּׁה, *woman*. (Gen. ii, 23.) Her name, therefore, is the more significant, because intended to express character and relation. Nevertheless, Paul predicates man's pre-eminence over the woman on both natural and moral grounds—on the priority of man's creation and on the priority of woman's sin. It is not important to this argument whether the order of creation was an after-thought with Paul, and not a part of the original plan intending to indicate superiority by priority, or whether, so intended, the design is simply not recorded in the Genesis of Scripture. It may, therefore, be assumed here as an accepted fact, generally, that man is placed in unquestionable pre-eminence over the woman, in some sense, in the order of God's pleasure, in the order of human creation, in the order of physical prowess, in the order of society at large, in the order of the family at home: not because man is more highly endowed with intellectual powers, for this may be so or not in a given case; not because his soul-nature is more sensitively alive to God's will, for that is not usually apparent in Christian assemblies; not because he sus-

* "He shall rule over thee." Gen. iii, 16.

tains a more responsible relation as a parent, for this would certainly be called in question by the thoughtful; but simply, and so far as appears in the Scriptures, on the ground that man was the first created, and woman was the first in sin; and for the further reason that, in the creative work, woman is at two removes from God and at one remove from man, in the sense that man was created *by* God and *for* God, to represent his image and glory, while woman was created *from* man and *for* man, and so represents man's glory. "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man, . . . forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." 1 Cor. xi, 3, 7, 9. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." 1 Tim. ii, 10–14.

The pre-eminence of man and the subordination of woman are the two things taught, constituting one fact, in this paragraph. Churchly assemblies are not mentioned in this connection, but it is presumable that this special provision was intended to govern her conduct in public. For while woman is directly prohibited from exercising the office of *teacher* in the Church—whatever that may especially import—she seems to have exercised this "gift" as a usual and unquestioned prerogative *in private*. The co-laborers of Paul at Ephesus, left in authority by him and charged with the supervision of the churchly interests there, furnish an illustrative instance. Aquila, of Alexandria, and Priscilla, his wife, having listened carefully in the synagogue to Apollos, himself "an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures," who, "being fervent in the spirit, taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John, . . . *they* (*plural*, προσελάβοντο,) *took him unto them, and* (*plural*, ἐξέθεντο,) *expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly*." Acts xviii, 25, 26. This circumstance of *private teaching* by a gifted woman is related as if it was neither uncommon nor disapproved in the understanding of the primitive Church.

Exactly what the function of *teacher* was, in distinction

from that of prophet, we are not informed in the New Testament. Paul enumerates three different kinds of public instructors as regular, besides the miscellaneous "gifts;" and the *apostles* (ἀπόστολοι) always appear as first in the order of rank, the *prophets* (προφῆται) as second, and usually the *teachers* (διδάσκαλοι) as third. "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles. . . . Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?" 1 Cor. xii, 28, 29. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. iv, 11, 12. That a broad distinction did exist in these branches of the Christian service is, then, a matter of fact; although an *apostle* at times could and did exercise the specific "gifts" of most, if not all, of those enumerated in the catalogue.*

Why, then, women were divinely appointed to the superior office of prophetess, but were divinely denied the inferior one of teacher, we are not told by the apostles. The fact itself, however, is self-apparent.† In the silence of Scripture we are left very much to the conclusions of reason. The appellatives, διδάσκαλος, *teacher*, and μαθητής, *learner*, are correlatives. Scholars regard the teacher as the equivalent of κατηχητής, a *catechist-teacher*, "according to the ancient way of teaching, where the teacher dictated, and the pupil repeated."‡ Biblicists consider the teacher of the New Testament as corresponding with ῥαββί, *rabbi*, in the Jewish Church,§ a position indicating at once superiority and authority of human origin and character, with large privileges of instruction, interpretation, and dictation. "Διδάσκαλοι appear as having a special function. . . . Upon them devolved the duty of giving progressive instructions in God's redeeming purposes."‖ Such are the conclusions of the learned, in the absence of more authoritative information. They are substantially agreed in giving to the *teacher* of the primitive Church a place in its

* Paul himself, for example, 1 Cor. i, 1; xiv, 18; 1 Tim. ii, 7, etc.

† Compare Acts xxi, 9; 1 Tim. ii, 12. ‡ Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

§ Dr. H. Cremer's Biblical and Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek; also Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of New Testament Greek. ‖ Cremer.

organization, but with a function special and distinctive from that of the *prophet.*

On this hypothesis the teacher represented the authority and wisdom of man, but the prophet represented the authority and wisdom of God. Woman was thence necessarily ineligible to the position of public "teacher," because its function would not only conflict with, but actually reverse, the order of pre-eminence and subordination existing between man and woman since the fall—the ground on which Paul places the prohibitive law in the passage under consideration.* For, in contra-distinction, the *prophetess*, προφῆτις, stood specially near to God, acted under God's influence, spoke on God's authority, communicated God's message, and assumed God's place by his own express and exclusive appointment. Hence woman as prophetess did not, and could not, "usurp authority over the man" in the same sense in which it was exercised by the teacher; and in the prophetic office man could not claim an exclusive monopoly based on nature, grace, or sin, but held it conjointly with woman, by divine appointment, and not of human authority. However, whether we accept or not this hypothesis, four things are clearly ascertained as matters of fact: (1) That in the New Testament sense prophet and teacher represented different and distinct duties, as their appellations and the apostolic discriminations designate; (2) of the two, the prophet was an officer of higher order than the teacher; (3) woman was debarred from the position of teacher because inconsistent with her present relation of subordination under the judicial sentence of sin; and (4) her ineligibility to the office of teacher was no bar to her service in public life as prophetess, whatever that may import. Her silence is thence imposed as becoming, because as teacher it were abnormal, unseemly, and an utter sacrifice of her *gratia modestiæ* to be found before the public wrangling or wrestling with men on grave questions of law or duty, criticising, fault-finding, questioning, disputing, and dictating with a masculine assumption of authority such as would evidently tend to disturb the solemnities of churchly assemblies, extending even to unnatural disagree-

* "A woman's public teaching was an approach to ruling over the man. . . . The silence was enjoined for the subjection, and not subjection for the silence."—Dr. De Loss Love, p. 30.

ments and disorder at home. None of these disagreeable peculiarities were present in the duties and service of the prophet.

It may be helpful to our better understanding of this whole question to ascertain the exact historical condition of woman among the nations where the Gospel was first preached, before entering into a more critical investigation of her true attitude, as fixed in the New Testament, on the point of silence and subordination in the services of the Church.

Her social *status* was simply deplorable. It has been so through all the historic ages, if we except a possible period in ancient Egypt.* The birth of a son is the occasion of great joy in the family; but that of a daughter is regarded as a great calamity—so afflictive, indeed, that the father refuses to look upon his own child, or to speak to its mother, while friends hasten to sympathize with the father as being greatly injured, and upbraid the innocent sufferer as having perpetrated upon him some great wrong! † In India, under such humiliation, the unwelcome little one is often buried alive. ‡ The lady of rank and the hard-worked peasant daughter are alike ignorant and degraded; and to teach them to read is accounted a folly and a sin. § Some believe that women have no souls, and are not fit for society. ‖ As a wife, woman is wedded from childhood, not, however, by her own choice or consent, but under the control of others; ¶ nor is she treated with the affection of a companion, but is doomed to be a slave, ** whose duty it is to drudge for her husband's comfort and pleasure, literally bearing all burdens, †† and performing all menial offices. ‡‡ To maintain parents is made compulsory with daughters. §§ An ancient custom is held in honor, in which an absent husband declines inquiring about the health of his wife at home,

* Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," vol. i, p. 4; Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," etc., vol. ii, p. 46.

† Dr. Thomson's "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 177; Miss Rogers' "Domestic Life in Palestine," p. 392.

‡ Rev. J. D. Brown, deceased, returned missionary from India.

§ "Scripture Manners and Customs," p. 271; "Domestic Life in Palestine," p. 123.

‖ Miss Rogers, p. 123. ¶ Rev. P. M. Buck, India Conf., M. E. Church.

** "Scripture Manners and Customs," p. 270.

†† Lane's "Modern Egyptians," vol. i, p. 252; Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," vol. ii, pp. 46, 47.

‡‡ Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," vol. ii, pp. 223, 224.

§§ Kenrick's "Ancient Egypt," vol. ii, p. 47.

he knowing her to be sick, although he carefully inquires about every body else. He never writes to her, but to a son, if they have one, and to a fictitious one if they have not. The Arabs even scandalize their own wives by speaking of them to others in a manner as infamous as it is suggestive of indelicacy and uncleanness.* The Chakams affect a holy horror at being touched by any part of a woman's dress.† "They pronounce women to be weak and inferior in most absolute terms, and in accordance with this idea is their deportment toward them. . . . It is very common to see small boys lord it over both mother and sisters in a most insolent manner; and they are encouraged to do so by the father. The evils resulting from this are incalculable. . . . Cases are rare where the husband has not, at some time or other, resorted to the lash to enforce obedience in his rebellious household. . . . Instances are not rare in which the husband kills the wife outright, . . . and no legal notice is taken of the murder."‡

To speak to a woman in public, even to his own wife, was one of those six things which a rabbi was not allowed to do.§ "In the Vinaya, a Bhikshu is not only forbidden to speak to or look at a woman, but he may not hold out his hand to his own mother even if she were drowning."‖ Thus the Brahmin in India, the Celestial of China, the Turk of Constantinople, the Jew of old Palestine, the Copt of ancient Egypt, the poet of cultured Greece, the senator of powerful Rome, have alike treated woman with undisguised contempt, and held it as a cardinal virtue to assign her to a mean and abject silence. Said Sophocles: "Order saves those who obey command; by those who rule this with firm hand it should always be sustained, and never for a woman be overturned." Said Euripides, the Athenian poet: "For a woman silence, sobriety, and in-doors are an adornment."¶ Said Callistratus, the model of Demosthenes, and great patron of eloquence: "The ornament of trees is foliage; of sheep, wool; of horses, the mane; of men, the beard; of women, silence."** So in tragedy

* "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 176. † Frankl's "Jews in the East," vol. ii, p. 81.

‡ "Land and Book," vol. i, p. 187.

§ Berachoth, fol. 43, b; Schwab, p. 404; see also Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. i, p. 214, note.

‖ Wilson's "Religion of the Hindus," vol. i, p. 360.

¶ Eurip., Heracl., 476. ** Whedon's quotation, N. T. Com., vol. iv, p. 111.

Medea expresses the bitterest irony respecting public opinion of her sex, and receives sympathy from the chorus:—

ΜΗΔ.—Ἐπίστασαι δὲ· πρὸς δὲ καὶ πεφύκαμεν
γυναῖκες, εἰς μὲν ἔσθλ' ἀμηχανώταται,
κακῶν δὲ πάντων τέκτονες σοφώταται.

ΧΟ.—Δίκα καὶ πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται. . . .
Στρέφουσι φᾶμαι.
Ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει·
οὐκέτι δυσκέλαδος
φάμα γυναῖκας ἕξει.*

MED.—But thou art capable: and also, besides, by nature
We women indeed are least competent in things noble,
While shrewdest plotters of all kinds of mischief.

CHO.—The rules of justice and every thing are again reversed;
Traditions change—
Character is coming to the female race:
No longer shall an ignoble
Reputation attach to women.

Said a Roman: "What has a woman to do with public haranguing?" And the answer was given: "Nothing, if our ancient customs prevail."† Said wise men: "Women should not read in the law for the sake of the honor of the synagogue!" Said Schoettgen: "Women were allowed in rabbinical schools, but only to hear, and never to speak or to ask a question." An outer court of the ancient temple was appropriated to women, but in a synagogue they were not permitted to *read*, though this was never denied to a child or a servant. "A certain matron asked Rabbi Eleazar: 'Wherefore were the Israelites who committed but one crime about the golden calf punished with a threefold penalty?' Eleazar replied: 'Women ought to know nothing but the distaff!'" "May the words of the law be burned rather than placed in the hands of women."‡ Rabbies did not hesitate on most trivial pretenses to vindicate their supposed right to degrade women by enforced ignorance, and then to despise the womanhood they had degraded by consigning it to shame and silence. Because in the law (Deut. v, 1; xi, 19) where the duty of instruction is imposed, the Hebrew *verbs* appear in the *mascu-*

* Eurip., Med., ls. 408–411, 417–420.

† Valer. Max., iii, 8.

‡ "Bammidbar Rabba," fol. 204, 4, 9, quoted by Bloomfield.

*line* gender, it was insisted, on that ground, that a *mother* was debarred from teaching her own son; also from teaching herself, because it was required to teach the "*children;*" and so none was authorized to teach a *woman*, because it was said, "Ye shall teach them to your *sons*," and it was not said also, "to your *daughters!*"* "Rabbis predicate four peculiarities of women: That they are wanton, (*luxuriosæ,*) that they are listeners, (*auscultatrices,*) lazy, (*pigræ,*) envious, (*zelosæ.*) Our rabbis judge that women are not lawful witnesses, (*illegitimas.*)"†

Out of this degraded female commonalty, naturally enough, there sprang manners characteristic of the sex when thus conditioned: manners of excitability, of disorder, and confusion extremely offensive to the cultured, and out of all propriety in the Christian assemblies. This was a subject of complaint in the fourth Christian century. Chrysostom describes the annoyance experienced under his own preaching thus: "Then, indeed, the women, from such teaching, *kept silence;* but now there is apt to be great noise among them, much clamor and talking, and nowhere so much as in this place. They may all be seen here talking more than in the market or at the bath. For, as if they came hither for recreation, they are all engaged in conversing upon unprofitable subjects. Thus *all is confusion*, and they seem not to understand that unless they are quiet they cannot learn any thing that is useful. For when our discourse strains against the talking, and no one minds what is said, what good can it do them?"‡

Finally, Dr. Anderson, describing the excitability and garrulity instinctive with women in the East, as illustrated in a church service under the supervision of a missionary lady, states: "The chapel was early full of women, all sitting on the floor, and each one crowding to get as near her as possible. They were very much like a hive of bees. The slightest thing would set them all in commotion, and they resembled a town-meeting more than a religious gathering. When a child cried, it would enlist the energies of half a dozen women with voice and gesture to quiet it. When some striking thought of some speaker flashed upon the mind of some woman, she would be-

* See Wetstein's quotation in full of "Kidduschim," fol. 29. 2.

† Buxtorf's Rabbinical Lexicon, col. 1,401, 1,402.

‡ Chrysostom, quoted by Dr. Whedon, New Testament Commentary, vol. iv, p. 111.

gin to explain it in no moderate tones to those about her, and this would set the whole off into a bedlam of talk which it would require two or three minutes to quell." *

With this unchanged and unchanging light upon both the picture and the page, we may begin to apprehend something of the difficulty and offense as they existed before Paul's mind. Corinthian women, from the instincts of their language and sex, were excitable and given to talkativeness. Of these, the great uncultured commonalty were offensively garrulous in the house of God, and violated the proprieties of the place. The public services were disturbed and disorderly. Probably masses of curious and unchristianized women were present in the congregations and contributed to this result. From Paul's frequent recurrence in this chapter to "the gift of tongues," it would seem that a good deal of noisy utterance and irregularity proceeded thence, suggestive of "madness" and "confusion." † Prophets and other officers of instruction were taken under apostolic direction. It was not the use, but the abuse, of these services that fell under censure. Against all this disorderly conduct, Paul's protest comes with all the purpose and directness of his own great character. With unusual emphasis and earnestness, he exclaims with a reason: "For God is not the author of confusion, ‡ but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." Then, rising to the dignity of his position, Paul commands the occasion, suppresses all commotion, and with his characteristic point and purpose, specifies: "Let your women *keep silence*," etc. All this is in perfect harmony with all the circumstances indicated, and meets every demand of the occasion without doing violence to the service or its cause. The picture is more than merely natural—it addresses itself to our intuitions as true.

Aside from the context, however, it is sufficiently apparent that there was, and must have been, some special *occasion* for the "shame" and "silence" so repeatedly invoked upon the character and conduct of these women in the church. To the thoughtful mind the logical inference is unavoidable that there

* "Oriental Churches," ii, 277. † Compare 1 Cor. xiv, 9–12, 16–19, 23–26, 33.

‡ This "*confusion*" (ἀκαταστασία, *disorder, commotion, tumult*) stands opposed in the antithesis to "*peace*," (εἰρήνη, *quiet, tranquility,*) and explains the character of the command which follows immediately: "Let your women *keep silence*," etc.

existed some custom, or fact, or some custom in fact, and out of the usual character, which was regarded as an abuse of privilege, and stood related to this ruling, whereupon Paul proceeds to lay down this prohibitive law; since so severe an interdiction fulminated upon any one class of believers, not applicable to all elsewhere, were unintelligible and inappreciable and impossible if it were wholly imaginary, baseless, and uncalled for. It is the need that necessitates the law. What that need was is already quite apparent. Further than this, it may be safely and fearlessly affirmed that neither in the texts themselves yet to be investigated, nor in their respective contexts, nor elsewhere in the Christian Scriptures, is there a shadow of warrant authorizing the opinion that the seal of silence was divinely placed on the lips of Christian women, when properly engaged in the public services of the sanctuary. For it must be borne in mind that the question, disembarrassed and simplified, is not now whether women are *entitled to preach the Gospel*, but whether they are remanded to *an absolute and perpetual silence* when related to the services in the Church of Jesus.

In pressing this inquiry, we may waive any instinctive desire common to the Teutonic races, and suppress any argument looking to the ennobling of woman's character, to the appreciation of her worth, to the honor of her love, to her assignment to an equality with man in accordance with the position, development, culture, and wealth of her womanhood. These are conditions which address themselves to our intelligence and appreciation; but the specific inquiry proposed leads to a critical examination of the words employed by Paul to the Corinthians, with special reference to the laws of etymology and emphasis involved: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their [*ἰδίους, own*] husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." 1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35.

The command thus strikes thrice and transversely across the position of the Christian woman when she enters the place and assumes the attitude of divine worship. *Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται αὐταῖς*

λαλεῖν . . . αἰσχρὸν . . . γυναιξὶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λαλεῖν. *Let your women in the churches keep silence: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; . . . a shame . . . for women to speak in* [the] *church.* These parts of the paragraph involve the points to be specially considered. We quote the common text, though a critical text will not affect our argument. The sentences are certainly significant. Many regard them as mandatory in purpose and unquestionable in character, teaching that for women in church silence is enjoined, and to speak is a shame. The examination of two or three words, whose emphasis and etymology are involved, will discover whether or not the interdiction of speech is absolutely imposed upon the Christian women of our worshiping assemblies. The verb σιγάτωσαν (*let them keep silence*) is sufficiently expressive; but the subjects of that command are the women of the Corinthian Church, to which the epistle was sent.*

The verb λαλέω is twice employed here to designate the character of the speaking or utterance which was regarded as disorderly, and so was forbidden: "Not permitted unto them *to speak* . . . a shame *to speak* in the church." This word, λαλέω, is one of the onomatopoetic class whose sound is suggestive of the sense, as is illustrated by such words as *thunder*, *rumbling*, *splash*, *babble*, *chatter*, and the like. The stem λαλ, *lal*, like *bar*, in barbarous, is considered to be based on its peculiar sound,† and so inherently conveys a signification of the same character. Thus, in comparative philology, it stands related to Latin *lallare*, to sing; German *lallen;* English *lull*, *lullaby*, etc. The word-radical, in itself, strictly expresses inarticulate sounds, but not intelligible speech; and so it is frequently applied in classic usage to inanimate objects, designating the murmuring of the trees, or instrumental music, as ἐν αὐλῷ λαλεῖν,‡ *to play on a flute*, or, μάγαδιν λαλεῖν,§ *to sound the harp.* So λαλέω is employed to indicate the utterances of the lower

* Dr. Duryea, making a defensive statement of the action of the Brooklyn Presbytery excluding women from participating, except silently, in public religious services, says: "Perceiving this fact, some have expressed the wish that Paul had added to his injunction—'*in Corinth.*' But he did not add it!" Nor was it needed. At the very beginning of this epistle he formally dedicated it to "*the Church which is at Corinth.*" Repetition was uncalled for.

† Valpy on Greek Language, p. 159.

‡ Theocrit., xx, 29. § Anax., Hoplom., 1.

animals, the twitter of birds, the chirping of locusts, the chattering of monkeys, and the barking of dogs, as in *λαλοῦσι μὲν οὗτοι φράζουσι δὲ οὔ**—*these, indeed, utter sounds, but they speak not.* Thence, by easy transition—by one remove from empty vocabilities—the word comes to be appropriated to beings of intelligence, and, in reference to little children, conveys the sense of *clack*, or *prattle*,† as in *παιδάριον ὢν δεινότατος λαλεῖν ἐδόκουν εἶναι*,‡ *I, being a little child, was thought to be a most astonishing one to prattle;* and *ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν*,§ *I was accustomed to prattle as a little child.* Hence, Dr. Robinson defines the proper meaning of *λαλέω* to be, "*to use the voice without any necessary reference to words spoken, and thus differing from εἰπεῖν, to speak*, and *λέγειν, to say.*" ‖ So in later Greek this word, still holding tenaciously to its stem-sense, becomes applied to utterances of a strange or foolish character. ¶

A careful analysis of the uses of *λαλέω* in the New Testament develops several particulars worthy of note in this connection. It occurs therein, in all, two hundred and ninety-four times, of which in two hundred and eighty-six instances the word stands related to persons, thrice it is applied to thunders, thrice to blasphemies of the beast, once to the utterances of the law, and yet once to the blood of Jesus "that speaketh better things than that of Abel." However, the character of the utterances themselves, rather than the number of persons indicated, is the thing that is conclusive of the

* Plutarch, ii, 909, A.

† So Yonge and Robinson.

‡ Xenophon, Cyropædia, i, 4, 12.

§ Paul, 1 Cor. xiii, 11.

‖ The philologist will be pleased to trace this radical sense throughout this word-family. The several members may be grouped thus:—

*α. The agent:* λάλαξ, λαλητής, λαλαγήτης, and ἡ λαλητρίς, *prattler, prater, babbler, croaker.*

*β. The action:* λαλέω, λαλαγέω, παραλαλέω, καταλαλέω, *to prattle, babble, chirrup, chirp, prate at random, chatter;* ἀλαλάζω, *to shout.*

*γ. The effect:* λαλιά, λάλη, λαλαγή, λάλημα, λάλαγμα, *a babbling, prattle, gossip, chattering talk;* also, αλαλη, ἀλαλά, αλαλγή, *a loud cry or shout;* ἀλαλητός, *a war-cry.*

*δ. The quality:* λαλητικός, λάλος, *given to babbling;* ἀλάλητος, *unutterable.*

¶ "Compare in English '*to talk nonsense*,' that is, foolishly." Robinson's Lexicon, p. 422. Illustrative examples may be found in 1 Tim. v, 13: "Tattlers also, and busy-bodies, *λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα*, speaking things which they ought not;" Jude 16: "Their mouth *λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα*, speaketh great swelling words," (that is, *boastful;*) 2 Cor. xi, 23: "*παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, I speak as a fool.*" 1 Cor. xiv, 9; 2 Cor. xii, 4; Matt. xii, 34, etc.

*usus* of the word.* Of the total two hundred and ninety-four instances occurring in the New Testament, about one hundred and sixty-six are referable to some external circumstance or textual adjunct denotive of stress or excitement, and one hundred and four additional represent some kind of supernatural communication; and, exclusive of the two instances now under consideration, there remain only twenty-two places wherein the word has an application to speech of ordinary character. Then of the two hundred and eighty-six examples involving *persons*, only sixteen show a usage of the word in a condition of things suggestive of application to a tranquil mind. In this very chapter λαλέω is applied to revelation once, to mystery once, to intelligent speech once, to prophesying twice, and to unknown tongues seventeen times, and twice it is applied to women, making twenty-four occurrences in all. As showing the great preponderance of probabilities touching the meaning of the word as applied in the New Testament in the direction of excited communication, these facts have a value which should not be overlooked in this expository argument; and the usage of the word in the chapter shows this infrequency of its application by Paul to ordinary speaking—once in twenty-four times.

Classic *usus*, then, exhibits the word itself, with all its word-family in strange unanimity, as conveying the fundamental sense of *chattering* or *babbling:* a view designated by Dr. Robinson as "using the voice without any necessary reference to words spoken, and so differing from εἰπεῖν and λέγειν." Then the New Testament, carrying forward this sense, modifies and applies it to things strange and foolish, perhaps also to the "gift of tongues;" and thence it passes to intelligent speech, but in a character of excited communication for the most part, which, in effect, where many persons are engaged in animated conversation, would inevitably lead to chattering or babbling, with the attendant idea of commotion, in public assemblies. And, in exact correspondence with these indications, we have the fact of the instinctive dispositions and characteristics of

* Rev. Mr. Ross says, (Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xxvi, p. 342:) "The usage of the word in the New Testament is conclusive on this point," and then proceeds in proof to enumerate the instances and usage of the *translators of our English version.* Surely the critical and scholarly will hardly accept the English translation, itself undergoing revision, as "*conclusive*" of the etymology of the Greek Testament.

the commonalty of women in Bible countries, with all the accompanying confusion and babel, as exampled in the historical illustration cited in the mission scene, and the description given by Chrysostom in the fourth Christian century. If, now, the context of this passage be found to sustain this view, the conviction will become almost resistless that the kind of speaking referred to, and denounced by Paul as a "shame" to women in Churches, was nothing other than a bedlam of chattering, unbecoming the house of God, and utterly demoralizing to the services of the sanctuary. Indeed, this whole chapter is an energetic effort on Paul's part to reform the Church of abuses noisy and babbling in character:—

Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking (*λαλέω*) with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak (*λαλέω*) to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine? and even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? . . . So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken (*λαλέω*)? for ye shall speak (*λαλέω*) into the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification; therefore, if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh (*λαλέω*) a barbarian, and he that speaketh (*λαλέω*) shall be a barbarian unto me. Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church. . . . Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? . . . If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak (*λαλέω*) with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? . . . How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any man speak (*λαλέω*) in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course. . . . If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace; for ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn. . . . For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the saints. Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, (*λαλέω*;) but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak (*λαλέω*) in the church. . . . Let all things be done decently and in order.

These strictures of the apostle in reference to parties gathered in Church, represented as a collection of persons piping and harping without giving forth distinct sounds; this declaration that unless they speak words easy to be understood they speak into the air; this comparison of the scene of unknown tongues to barbarians and madness; this medley described in their coming together, produced by their psalms, doctrines, tongues, revelations, and interpretations; this direction that speakers shall proceed "only by two, or at the most by three, and that by course;" this requirement that when something is revealed to one sitting by, "the first shall hold his peace;" this direct protest that God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all the Churches of the saints; this closing sentence: "Let every thing *be done decently and in order*"—*this state of facts* reveals sources of disorder and occasions of annoyance which loudly called for reproof and suppression, and with reference to which the women were ordered back into silence, because forward in meaningless utterances and medley demonstrations in the Christian Churches.

Now, in all this there is nothing as yet that appears in the text or context which is conclusive of Paul's intention to discriminate against women of real culture and Christian propriety in common with the garrulous crowd, or against Christian women of any other age or any other country than that where this reform of abuse was in demand, or that women were remanded to silence in the Churches for any other offense than that already described and illustrated. *Petitio principii* is not proof; assumption is not even probability. At this point direct issue is made with the advocates of the opposite view. The *onus probandi* rests with the affirmant, to show that the law enforcing silence was in intent absolute and universal, as is claimed, and so was intended to apply to all women in all countries in all time; that the word λαλέω, a key-word to the interpretation, does not mean what its radical sense shows, to *chatter*, *clamor*, or *talk*, but does mean, in distinction, all manner of public address appertaining to Church services; in short, that the rule enforcing silence upon women was not related to any class of persons, as at Corinth, or to any particular offense among them, but referred to public speaking generally, and so in its measure and purpose was *absolute*, and therefore un-

qualifiedly absolute—so that now women of high endowments, of beautiful character and culture, and delicate persuasions to all that is good, are forever remanded to a suppression of speech, to an absolute silence in the service of song; that the interdiction of utterance falls with full effect upon all such as would render churchly response in the liturgy; that women in all Christendom are to-day acting in weekly and open violation of this divine command whenever, in our churches, they open their lips to repeat the Lord's prayer, or whenever they proceed to teach others in the Sunday-school, or whenever they break the silence within church walls by Christian salutations, or whenever they express their yearnings of soul in social services in behalf of themselves or their children or friends, or whenever they would individually be instructed by their ministers in the church, since the same iron law rules *absolutely*, "If they will learn, let them ask their husbands at home;" and if they have no husbands, or if their husbands are as ignorant and degraded as themselves, let them go untaught in the Lord by express provision, utterly interdicting the Lord's own commission: "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the Gospel to every creature;*" much less shall any woman be found praying or speaking in public, though both had their place in the apostolic Church, as appears in this very epistle, and within four chapters of this very place, where Paul does not suppress *the thing*, but only governs the *manner* of its performance, when he says: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head." 1 Cor. xi, 5.

To such extremes must the adherents of the opposition go, in order to be thoroughly consistent. Extreme as these conclusions are, they are legitimate to the premises assumed by the advocates of woman's *absolute* silence, as imposed to be perpetuated in the Christian Church. For they who champion that cause are painfully embarrassed with the inconsistency of their position. Prominent among these is the Rev. Mr. Ross, whose articles on this subject appeared in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," as named at the head of this paper. He says:—

This *reason*, to which Paul refers, is *as permanent and extensive as the race itself.* . . . So long as man is made male and female, the reason of *the prohibition exists* Let it be understood that these commands are *general rules* (!) for fully-constituted Churches. They *admit of exceptions* in case of *weak Churches* composed

*unimpaired*, and, of course, the prohibition itself *abides in full force.*

The reasons given [for silence imposed] are *as extensive as . . . the human family*, and *as permanent as the law of the sexes.* . . . Paul secures order . . . by prohibiting positively, expressly, repeatedly, and *unqualifiedly*, the women *from speaking at all.*—P. 340.

almost entirely of women, and female teachers of the ignorant negro and heathen. It is *not only permitted* to women, but *it becomes their duty to do*, in such case, what it would be improper for them to do *in well-constituted Churches.* —P. 756.

It is interesting, at least, to understand how a prohibition pronounced as absolutely "permanent as the law of the sexes," "prohibiting positively, expressly, repeatedly, and unqualifiedly, the women from speaking at all," should yet be made mere "general rules" which "admit of exceptions" *ad libitum;* and how, "so long as man is made male and female the reason of the prohibition exists unimpaired," and "the prohibition abides in full force," yet the inflexible law and its reason are so accommodating as to get completely reversed in case of "weak" Churches, or those not "fully constituted," so that what would be improper (?) in well-constituted Churches actually becomes a high Christian "duty" in others! * So the great iron rule of the apostle crumbles away in the presence of the first case of expediency, and the "unqualified" injunction is dissolved wherever "the ignorant negro and heathen" are involved! This doctrine of shifting and shiftless *expediency* is as dangerous as it is injudicious when falling into the hands of an expositor who teaches it to be not a sin, but only "improper," and not only allowable, but actually a Christian "duty," for good and gifted women to violate at times so plain a law of divine prohibition! This is not only a complete departure from Paul's "unqualified" precept, as it is assumed to be, but it literally relegates the whole subject at last to human judgment for decision. For, if exceptions are allowable at all, the rule has ceased beyond recall to be of universal application, and the "prohibition," which was supposed to be "as permanent as the race itself," breaks down completely, only leaving it to human judgment to determine when women may speak and when they shall be suppressed in the godly exercise of their Christian gifts in the churches. If, then, Mr.

* "It is not denied that women properly qualified may teach and exhort familiarly in the household, and in the social circle and Bible class." But "shall a woman in a *formally constituted assembly of the Church* assume the place and perform the office of minister?"—Dr. Durbea.

Ross should proceed with self-constituted autocratic authority to decide so debatable a question in a given case, what would he have to say when others, and women, his equals in judgment, we will suppose, should choose to differ with all deference from his conclusion?

Moreover, this "prohibition" is as absolutely "permanent and extensive as the race itself," or it is *not*. If it is, no human power under any pretext can suspend or vacate its application in any case whatever, for its violation were simply sinful, and the plea of expediency or necessity cannot be allowed. Nowhere is Paul himself found referring to admitted "exceptions in case of weak Churches," or places without "a formally constituted assembly." He furnishes no subterfuge for evasion or escape. His language is simple and unqualified: "Let your women keep silence in the churches." Let those who interpret this command as dooming women of noble gifts and high culture and Christian grace to an absolute and perpetual silence in the Christian Church whenever they worship God, stand by the impossible and absurd conclusions to which they are forced by the principle of consistency, or surrender a theory which they cannot prove in the light of historic facts, and so accept an interpretation which shows that the apostle's mind was directed against an *abuse*,* and not a use, of privilege; against disorderly chatterings of women in the church, and not against the Christian women themselves offering services with all propriety—as when the court-crier commands "silence in court," it is understood that disorder must cease, that business may proceed undisturbed. Now, if Paul really meant, as is assumed, that his prohibition should be *not* universal, but be inoperative in a large class of exceptional instances, why did he not tell us so himself explicitly? And if he did make its application universal, why are the advocates of women's silence found insisting on exceptions to his ruling? And if he did *not* legislate a prohibition that was permanent for all time, and as universal as the race, why do they argue that he did? And if he has left the application of the law an open question, to be sometimes valid and sometimes vacated, who is to decide in the absence of divine authority? But what is the mean-

* "This whole fourteenth chapter is devoted to directions, . . . in order to correct *certain abuses in their public worship*."—Mr. Ross, p. 350.

ing of this attempt to hold on to "both horns of the dilemma" at the same time; this endeavor to inconsistently interpret a given precept as unqualifiedly absolute, and yet as unqualifiedly conditional—as necessarily applicable to the women of all Christendom during all time, but with as many exceptions in reserve unknown to the Scriptures as the interpreter may choose to elect; to muzzle the mouths of all Christian, cultured women in the direction of good when within Church walls, by the forced interpretation of a rule they cannot maintain — unless it be to show by these very embarrassments, which complicate the position, that the arguments adduced are utterly illogical, and the interpretations made are at war with Gospel truth?

We conclude, therefore, that the kind of meeting in which women are commanded to keep silence is *every sort of religious meeting* where both sexes are present.—Mr. Ross, p. 352.

*Sabbath-schools* are not *the kind* of meetings described or referred to. . . . The word "*silence*" *does not cover singing*, for it was used with express reference to speaking. If we appeal to logic, let us be governed by it.—P. 756.

Well, well! Now give us a new dictionary, that we may be instructed how singing is simply another way to "*keep silence!*" And does it not seem a little peculiar that the rule that applies *universally* to Church assemblies does not work in certain "*kinds*" of meetings; and that Sabbath-schools have to be set aside as impliedly so irreligious in character as to be excluded from "every sort of religious meeting?" This will strike the Christian intelligence of the community as a marvelous discovery—the more since Paul himself, so far from having "*described or referred to*" any "*kind*" of religious meetings whatever, did not himself even hint that such a discrimination was possible! What he did say was: "Let your women keep silence in the churches." There is neither classification nor limitation beyond that. "*Kind* of religious meeting" is an afterthought with expositors, but without warrant from Paul. To maintain, then, that the rule which prohibits speech is at once "permanent and extensive as the race itself," but altogether dependent on the kind of religious meetings in each instance where it is to apply, is as illogical in reasoning as it is absurd in fact. "If we appeal to logic, let us be governed by it," truly! Even Dr. Duryea adopts this indefensible mode of statement. He says: "The phrase 'keep silence' stands for a

word that excludes *all forms of speech.* But it is objected: 'This leads to absurdity.' A woman cannot respond in the services, or sing in the act of praise! To this is sufficient the answer: Teaching involves authority, and so superiority. Devotional utterance assumes nothing of the sort."

Now, it may be a "sufficient answer" for the purpose had in view by Dr. Duryea, but it is, nevertheless, not a sufficient answer, unless it be implied that "*devotional utterance*" and "*singing*" mean to "*keep silence!*" The objection is not vacated by the answer. The fallacy of his argument discovers itself in holding to a theory which assumes that the law to be universally observed must be universally binding, while yet he himself undertakes to discharge that obligation on his own responsibility whenever in his judgment its application would eventuate in absurdity! To maintain the absoluteness of the law is to surrender the right to discriminate in its applications to different kinds of religious meetings. Both cannot be true. One other hypothesis frees the situation from all the absurdities that unavoidably attach to this: namely, that the apostle's rule designs to suppress the noisy interruptions and chatterings incident to Churchly assemblies; aims to suppress *the abuses*, but not to suppress a majority of members in Christ's Church—a view which may be extended to include the improper use of the gifts of prophecy and tongues suppressed by Paul when he protests that "*God* is not the author of *confusion*, but of quiet in all the Churches of the saints."

Another difficulty confronts those who oppose this right of speech within the Christian Church. The advocates of this doctrine are manifestly embarrassed at finding themselves at cross-purposes with Paul where he merely offers a regulation to govern the manner of public address, instead of silencing outright all manner of speech by an express injunction. In this same epistle, within four chapters of this same place, and in respect to some of these same women, Paul said: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head." As to the fact of praying and prophesying in the church no remark whatever is made by Paul. In the legislative sense there is neither express permission nor prohibition. Rather, both services are assumed to be entirely right, as a matter of course. Yet he prescribes *how* these shall

be conducted before Christian assemblies. Now, this was the moment of all others to extinguish forever all female prophecy and prayer if he would. It could not have failed in the understanding of all Christendom beyond recall had he chosen to say just then that the services of womanly prayer and prophesying should be henceforth discontinued. But did he do it? Nothing of the kind. Instead of remanding to silence the gifted women thus engaged, he points out simply an impropriety of their manner, giving a reason, and then directing how these services shall be conducted thereafter. To govern the method implies the continuance of the service. To say that Paul undertook in the first instance to regulate the *way* in which public prayer and prophecy were to proceed, and then, chapters afterward, returned to the subject and interdicted the prophecy and prayer themselves, is simply incredible in the absence of a necessitating theory. Nor is it Pauline thus to take offensive troubles by sections. His directness of character always goes to the core at once. To suppose that he peremptorily *un*did at last, as wrong, what he took in hand, allowed by silence, and regulated by a special legislation, at the first, as right, is to deprive the whole procedure of that noble judgment and directness which so distinguished the mind of this famous apostle.

"Paul for the time seems to allow the practice, while he condemns the manner of its performance. . . . He may have allowed an existing custom to pass unrebuked while he called attention to the indecency of its performance; and, having rebuked the indecency, he may in another part of the same letter have forbidden the custom itself."—Mr. Ross, p. 353. "A precept of an apostle may discontinue a previous custom."—Dr. Duryea.

In point of fact, Paul does not "*seem*" to allow the practice, *but he allows it!* Besides, to "discontinue a *custom*" is one thing, and to discontinue a *prophet* is quite another. "A precept of an apostle *may* discontinue a previous *custom*," but we do not know that any apostle ever suppressed a Christian *prophetess*. Nor is it pertinent to suppose what Paul "*may*" or "*might*" have done; we are only interested in what he *did* do as a matter of fact. He might have commanded the sun to stand still, but he did not. So far from discontinuing the function of

the prophetess, prediction had foretold its place in the Christian system, and an apostle proclaimed it the divine will, and the Pentecost as the day when women were to be fully inaugurated to their prophetical work. We know, therefore, that women were appointed to this service, and were divinely endued and endowed for its sacred performance; and we have no authority for believing that their office was ever abolished, in distinction from that of the men, or, indeed, that it was ever abolished at all. What, then, was the precise attitude assigned to woman in the New Testament in respect to public speaking? what the divine appointment and purpose as to her rightful prerogative and function in the Church of Jesus?

Eight hundred years before the birth of Christ a Hebrew prophet arose who foretold the dispensation of the Spirit, who glorified the advantages of the Gospel, who predicted the function of prophecy to be bestowed on women as characteristic of the Church of Christianity. When, then, the day of Pentecost had come upon the apostles, Peter arose before the multitude, himself under the influence of the Spirit, and addressed his brethren, naming this prophet of the Hebrews, quoting the words of his prophecy, and proclaiming the occasion then present as the one of predicted power and fulfillment. He said: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy.'"*

Now it is worthy of note (1) that the Spirit's influence was bestowed upon men and women without distinction: "I will pour out of my Spirit *upon all flesh;*" (2) that the official function was conferred expressly upon men and women without distinction: "*Your sons and your daughters;*" and (3) the peculiar service imposed is rendered unusually emphatic in the sentence by position and repetition: "*Sons and daughters* . . . servants and *handmaidens* . . . *they shall prophesy.*"† In the

* Acts ii, 16–18, quoting Joel ii, 28, 29.

† "Now God poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, so that men and women *did prophesy in the primitive Churches.*"—Rev. Mr. Ross, p. 346.

course of sacred history the prophetical gift in the possession of woman was not a new thing. The odes of Deborah and Hannah were known to all the Hebrew ages after them, and the prophecies of Miriam and Huldah * belonged to the old dispensation; while in the apostolic period "there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser," (Luke ii, 36,) and also "four daughters" of Philip the evangelist, "virgins, which did prophesy." † Acts xxi, 8, 9. This special provision made in the Gospel scheme according to the ancient prediction, this express revival of the order on the day of Pentecost formally giving prominence to women, and the perpetuation of such service in the Christian Church, are facts of significance in the exposition of this subject.

Philologists and writers are silent as regards any distinction in the function of prophets in exercise by the two sexes. As the Scriptures are also silent, it may be safely assumed that none existed. Precisely what its sacred office designated, then, must be learned from the etymology of the terms employed to convey its character and purpose, from the coördinates prophet and prophetess, and the corresponding verbs, נבא and *προφητεύω*, which are equivalents in the Hebrew and Greek texts. *Prophet*, *προφήτης*, *ὁ*, (נָבִיא, *vates*,) is derived "from *πρό*, *before*, and *φημί*, *I speak*—not *πρό*, according to time, except in a secondary and derived sense, but as *to place* or *manner*." ‡ It designates a "person gifted for the exposition of divine truth;" § "a divine teacher," ‖ "one who speaks openly, . . . who proclaims a divine message," ¶ belonging to "a class of instructors or *preachers* next in rank to the apostles, and before the *διδάσκαλοι*;" ** "*an interpreter of scripture, a preacher*." †† In respect to *prophetess*, *προφῆτις*, *ἡ*, (נְבִיאָה,) authorities indicate the difference by gender,

* Judges iv, 4; v; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Exod. xv, 20; 2 Kings xxii, 14.

† "We can find no instance in the Bible of a woman *speaking in public*."—Mr. Ross, p. 746. "Now God poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, so that men *and women* did prophesy in the Primitive Church."—P. 346.

"But he that prophesieth *speaketh unto men* to edification and exhortation and comfort. . . . But he that prophesieth *edifieth the church*."—Paul, 1 Cor. xiv, 3, 4.

"Our Lord commissioned no women among the apostles and evangelists."—Dr. Duryea. We must admire the ingenuity and prudence of this last and carefully-worded statement, as the omission of *prophets* and *prophetesses* is very significant.

‡ Dr. Cremer. § T. Sheldon Green's Lexicon of New Testament Greek.
‖ Greenfield. ¶ Cremer. ** Robinson. †† Liddell and Scott.

without a difference of service, designating her as "a gifted female teacher," * "who has consecrated herself to God." † Besides the *predictive* sense represented in the Hebrew verb נבא, it means "to speak, to announce;" ‡ "to teach the divine will;" "to instruct the people;" § and its equivalent προφητεύω means "to set forth matter of divine teaching;" ‖ "proclaiming God's will;" ¶ "to exhort, reprove, threaten, under divine influence, as embassadors or interpreters of his will;" ** "*to publicly expound, to preach.*" ††

Three noteworthy facts are here settled philologically beyond questioning on the highest authorities known to criticism, namely, 1. That prophetess meant an interpreter of Scripture, an expounder, a preacher; 2. That her express vocation was to instruct the people, to exhort, to reprove, to preach, as the interpreter of Scripture; and, 3. That her proper place in the organization of the Christian Church was "next in rank to the apostles, and before the διδάσκαλοι." "The prophets of the New Testament were supernaturally illuminated *expounders* and *preachers*." ‡‡ Yet Mr. Ross says: "*Prophecy* is never used in the New Testament for preaching."—P. 345. "In no passage in the New Testament can either the verb προφητεύω, or the noun προφήτης be proved to refer to, or include, ordinary *preaching*."—Pp. 345, 346. Dr. Van Dyke says: "We challenge the production of one, only one, clear instance of a woman being appointed or recognized of God as a *preacher*." Dr. Duryea says: "In the Apostolic Church it was *not* the custom for *women to preach*. . . . There is yet *no proof* that these inspired women exercised the gift *in public*, promiscuous, constituted assemblies of the Church." To all of which answer may be made: 1. That the etymology of the Greek and Hebrew prove that in the New Testament sense especially, *the prophet* was *a preacher*, and *prophesying* meant *preaching*. 2. That "preaching," as defined by Webster, means, "*To pronounce a public discourse*," and this idea, so ingrained in the word in the public understanding, puts the burden of proof upon those who

* Green. † Greenfield.
‡ Fuerst's Hebrew Lexicon.
§ B. Davidson's Analytical Hebrew Lexicon.
‖ Bagster's Analytical Lexicon of New Testament Greek.
¶ Cremer. ** Robinson. †† Liddell and Scott.
‡‡ Dr. Smith's Bible Dictionary, Huckett's edition, 1871.

claim that Christian prophetesses were accustomed to preach *in private.* Moreover, it must *be proved*, not assumed, that there was any distinction in the function or in the service as exercised by prophetic men and women, in the apostolic times. Paul distinctly affirms: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men (*ἀνθρώπους*) to edification and exhortation and comfort; . . . he that *prophesieth edifieth the Church.*"

Dr. Duryea remarks: "If the Spirit chose in sovereignty to elect and inspire women with gifts of prophecy, and they could show the signs of a prophet, they were not forbidden to speak. Under the same conditions they would not be forbidden now." * Then women as prophets were not forbidden to speak in public at all in the primitive Church, since they certainly showed "the signs" when Anna and the "four daughters" of Philip were permitted the service by the Church, and "did prophesy." On the historical aspect of the question, at least, this is a surrender of the whole ground of controversy. What, then, was "not forbidden," and was comprehended in "the gift of prophecy?" Not only "*to preach*," as has been shown, for "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, . . . edifieth the Church." But now these women "were supernaturally illuminated expounders and preachers." So are all who are entitled to preach Jesus as "called of God," whether women or men. Whoever assumes to preach Christ without the divine or supernatural impression of its being his personal duty and responsibility, goes to the sacred work "*un*called and unauthorized," and renders it a perfunctory profession. An impression and influence from God upon the soul, whereby he realizes, "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel," are not natural, but supernatural. Supernatural illumination exhibits the seals of divine authority to preach as distinctly as the inspiration of God, if, indeed, they are not substantially one. The Christian preacher may not be inspired in the same measure and to the same purpose as apostles were when they wrote, or as prophets were when they predicted; but who knows that the impression and influence realized from God differ in any important aspect from what was experienced by prophets when they "preached, exhorted, edified, and comforted" the ancient Church? The faculty of

* Dr. Duryea.

prophecy, *per se*, covered both prediction and preaching; the supernatural illumination for preaching alone is none the less supernatural now that the element of prediction is omitted. And if it be claimed that women at present cannot show "the signs" of an ancient prophetess, and so should be excluded from participation in public services, what shall we say of *the men* also, who, as successors of the apostles, cannot claim to be inspired of God in the same sense? The test, if allowed in one case, must not be disallowed in the other. If women are now not inspired of God, neither are the men, and so both should be excluded from preaching in the Church of Christ. Our reasoning must be *argumentum ad judicium*, and not mere *argumentum baculinum*.

Dr. Van Dyke himself takes unwarrantable ground when he says: "The preaching of the Gospel by women is without warrant from Scripture;" and so they are unauthorized "to undertake the work which Christ and his apostles committed to *men*." He says nothing of the unauthorized abandonment of a service once distinctly and supernaturally committed to *women!* In support of his position he quotes Paul to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful *men* who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. ii, 2. Dr. Van Dyke is not critical. He has given us the English, which is ambiguous at least. Had he consulted the Greek text, he must have seen that the very point which he emphasizes as decisive for his view is in fact against him. The word is not *ἀνήρ*, *man*, in sharp contradistinction from woman, as he seems to assume, but *ἄνθρωπος*, which represents *both* men and women, and so is generally rendered "*an individual, a person, mankind.*" The passage then may read with strict propriety: "These things do thou commit *unto faithful persons*, who shall also be qualified to instruct others."

The following graceful paragraph will be appreciated, coming as it does from an eminent biblicist, known wherever the English language is spoken:—

"There is good reason why men should keep well in mind the peculiar benediction which rests on godly women, and their peculiar aptitude for efficient service under the Gospel. We ought to recognize their special capabilities; we ought to make the most of them, and devise methodical plans for that end by

the exercise of our best wisdom. No effort could be more in harmony with the will of Christ, and the practice of the apostles. Jesus Christ accepted the ministry of the Galilean women; and the apostle of Jesus Christ has messages of special earnestness and significance for 'women who labored with him in the Gospel.'" Phil. iv, 3.*

In view, then, of the historical degradation common to women among the ancient nations, as indicated in the maxims and usages of the sage and the orator, the legislator and the poet; in view of the manifest distinction of character and service existing between the offices of prophetess and teacher in the New Testament, to the first of which woman is eligible, while from the latter she was debarred on the ground of nature and grace; in view of the classical sense of λαλέω being *to chatter, to babble*, otherwise describing "inarticulate sounds, without any necessary reference to words spoken"—a sense shown to be common to all the branches of the Greek stem; in view of the large preponderance of probabilities indicating the prevailing usage of this word in the New Testament as having reference to some exciting cause or excitable occasion; in view of the natural impulse to chatter, and customs of noisy demonstrations characteristic of "the garrulous commonalty" of women in public assemblies in those countries, as illustrated in the missionary scene described, and a similar state of facts protested against by Chrysostom in the fourth century—scenes which were, indeed, "a shame" and a confusion in any Church of Christ; in view of the self-apparent fact that Paul's prohibition is directed against certain abuses which had sprung up in connection with the public services in the Church, as shown in this entire chapter, and especially in the verse which precedes the one under consideration, "For God is not the author of *confusion*, but of peace, (quietness,) in all Churches of the saints;" in view of the dedication of this epistle "*Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth*," whose abuses of privilege Paul is expressly correcting by the imposition of "silence" and "shame" for unchurchly behavior of women in their Christian assemblies; in view of the fact that the assumption that women universally are to be taken as the subject of σιγάτωσαν, "*let them keep silence*," consigns all, including the best gifted and cultured to an unqnali-

* Dr. John S. Howson, Dean of Chester, England.

fied and perpetual silence within the Church of God, and suppresses all audible service by response, by prayer, by song, by speaking, by conversation, by teaching, in the Sabbath-school, in the Christian assembly, in the presence of the other sex, within the church walls; in view of the circumstances that womanly prophecy was so largely provided for in the Christian system, was so conspicuously proclaimed in ancient prediction, was so formally inaugurated in the Church of Christ on the day of Pentecost, was so unquestionably practiced in the times of the apostles; in view of the fact that the prophetical function was conferred upon men and women in common, without distinction or restriction, in the same sense, in the same measure, for the same purpose, and with the same warrant; in view of the consideration that praying and prophesying by women were a part of the public services in full exercise and recognition in the Christian assemblies of the Church when Paul's rules of silence were fulminated against the abuse and abusers of the Christian right of speech; in view of Paul having personally and previously corrected a mere matter of Christian impropriety pertaining to the manner of conducting this branch of the service, while prescribing its proper method of procedure for the future, without expressing one word of condemnation against the service itself as such, when he said, "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head;" in view of Paul's historical relation to this question, his subsequent return to the subject in order to abolish a service which had been ordained with so much circumstantiality at the beginning, and ordained by the same sanctions which ordained the apostolate itself, consigning in one sentence to an unqualified and perpetual silence and shame a whole order of prophetic women in distinction from prophetic men, without one word of explanation for the understanding of the ages to come—a procedure so violent to our intelligence as to seem utterly inconsistent, inconceivable, and impossible in the Pauline character; in view of there being no other scriptural ground whatever than these two passages now in controversy on which to base a conclusion that prophesying and praying in public, in the New Testament sense of these terms, were then withdrawn from women; in view of the fact, which is incontrovertible, that, whatever else prophesying and praying

in public meant, they did *not* mean to "*keep silence*," but did mean "to exhort, reprove, threaten, as embassadors or interpreters of God's word," and "to publicly expound, to preach," since "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort," and "he that prophesieth edifieth the Church;"—these considerations, taken unitedly, enforce the conclusion that Paul never contemplated for one moment issuing a decree of either specific condemnation upon the order of prophetic women in the Church, or of enforcing a law of universal silence upon the Christian women of all the ages, and that he never intended to suppress the ministry of a cultured spiritual womanly influence and service in the sanctuary where Christ is to be glorified; but that he did mean to put to "shame" and "silence" forever all public disorder and "confusion," as unbecoming as it is profaning to the solemnities and sanctity of the Church of Christ.

---

## ART. IV.—SOME PHASES OF THE CHINESE PROBLEM.

*The Chinese Problem.* By L. T. TOWNSEND, D.D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1876.
*The Chinese in America.* By Rev. O. GIBSON, A.M. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1877.

THE generation of men now passing away will long be remembered on account of their splendid successes in mastering the physical forces, and bringing them under intelligent control. The telegraph is their work, both as to its discovery and its application to the work of transmitting messages by land and sea. The steam-engine was in existence when they came on the stage, but it was very imperfect, and had all the uncertainty of a half-broken colt. It remained for them to train the colt to a trusty horse, and to so add strength to his muscles that he is equal to a race of a thousand miles across the plains and over the mountains, or to a show of marvelous strength and endurance in the factory or the press-room. Fulton's steamboat, which made such a sensation on the Hudson River seventy years ago, was the idea out of which, under their toil and genius, has grown the noble steamship now found on all waters. They did a noble work, and have in it an imperishable monument.

These victories over physical nature have paved the way to, and made inevitable, consequences of the greatest moment to our Christianity and civilization. They have practically annihilated distance, and so brought nations that we regarded as most remote to our very door. They have brought into the foreground questions that were before of the smallest possible importance. A quarter of a century ago the Chinese and Japanese were almost unknown to the American public. We thought of China and Japan as countries on the outskirts of civilization, in whose people we had little reason to interest ourselves. We ridiculed their customs and usages, so far as they were known to us, and made light of their forms of worship. But the rapid progress of steam navigation, with the laying of the ocean cables, and the consequent diffusion of knowledge and the means of easy and rapid transit across the ocean, has brought about a complete revolution. Not only do many English-speaking people visit or reside in what was once far-off Cathay, but the Chinese in numbers now confront us on our own shores. Men study the civilization and usages of the Chinese, not to gratify an idle curiosity, but because they are driven to it by the necessity which has brought them in contact with the Mongolian race. The religions of the Orient have acquired a new interest from the fact that their temples are set up and their followers abound in our own land. We are driven to investigation, because we must know what we would successfully oppose. The election of Dr. S. Wells Williams to the professorship of the Chinese language in Yale College, and the matriculation of scores of Chinese and Japanese youth in our various institutions of learning, are significant of occurring changes.* On the other hand, works are being written from the Chinese and Japanese stand-points against Christianity, and a learned disciple of Confucius daily expounds and defends the doctrines of his master in San Francisco.

This altered condition of affairs is not without its disturbing element on both sides of the Pacific. The Mongolian finds his old ways jostled by a new civilization which is creeping upon him, and gives vent to his indignation by an occasional out-

* The Chinese residents of San Francisco have petitioned the Board of Education of that city for a school for their children, to be conducted after the manner of other city schools.

break of violence among the masses, or in the steady opposition of the ruling classes. And on this side the presence of the Chinese has awakened a morbid fear, especially among the laboring classes of the Pacific coast, which finds vent in Anti-Chinese leagues, associations, and mobs; and, moreover, it has been deemed of sufficient importance to occupy a considerable part of a session of Congress.

The subject, though a new one, has called out quite a voluminous literature, including the two books which stand at the head of this article, each of which deals with a particular phase of this many-sided subject.

Dr. Townsend's work is an unpretentious little volume of eighty-six pages, which, in five successive chapters, treats of Chinese Immigration, as related to International Politics, Political Economy, Education, Morals, and Religion. The immediate cause of the appearance of the book, as appears from the author's preface, was "the recent hostile demonstrations against the Chinese in California," also "the more recent efforts in the United States Senate to induce the Government to modify the existing treaty with China." While there might be reason to question whether "being on the Pacific coast during the summer of 1875, and enjoying rare opportunities for gaining information," would furnish sufficient data for a "critical inquiry and study," yet the merit of the book does not depend on the author's acquaintance with the Chinese people. This fact the scope of the book, as given in the opening chapter, makes evident:

> The position we are compelled to take, however, is this: unless there should be such a radical reconstruction of the entire genius of our American Republican institutions as to make our national policy, if not our entire body politic, essentially and fundamentally different from what it has been during the past century, then it is simply impossible for our Government to say to any foreign people, "You are interdicted, and cannot dwell within our borders."

The argument in support of the above proposition is equally good whether you substitute for the words "foreign people" Chinese, Negroes, Dutch, or Swedes. We commend the book to those orators who are declaiming so loudly against Chinese immigration, and who are calling on Congress to enact a law for its prohibition.

The second book, by Rev. O. Gibson, who, since its publication, has been made a doctor by Alleghany College, his Alma Mater, was evidently written in the heat of the struggle which the presence of the Mongolian race has created on the Pacific coast, and in which he has borne a noble part, and bears throughout a savor of the indignation the writer feels at the wrongs inflicted on the Chinese by the venal officials and lower classes of San Francisco. It contains a just and candid estimate of the Chinese people, and at the same time a faithful history of recent events, that might properly be bound in the same volume with a history of the Thugs of India, or of the first ten years of Spanish intercourse with the natives of the West Indies. The impression which these outrages have made upon the Chinese themselves may be gathered from a single sentence taken from an appeal to the citizens of San Francisco, wherein the Chinese say: "If these enactments are the legitimate offspring of the American civilization and the Jesus religion, you can hardly wonder if the Chinese people are somewhat slow to embrace the one or to adopt the other."

We propose to examine some of the statements of these volumes, especially of the latter, and also to present some thoughts awakened by them on the general subject. We turn first to a remark of Dr. Gibson:—"They have always discouraged emigration from their own shores, and have been constantly and bitterly opposed to every attempt by outside nations to settle among them."—P. 29.

Dr. Gibson has, we think, been led into error on this point, the truth being that the rigid exclusiveness of China is of recent date, both as respects foreigners and their religions. We have records* of a very ancient intercourse between China and the nations of Central and Western Asia; also with Rome in the days of her pride, and even with Arabia. Caravans passed and repassed; imperial embassies came and went. The Jews found a home in China as early at least as 250 B. C. A synagogue existed until quite recently, and a few of the people yet remain who keep the Sabbath, and are known among the Chinese by the name Tiau-kin-kiau—the sect which plucks out the sinew. There are also evidences of the colonization of the Chi-

* See Hunt's "Library of Commerce," vol. i.

nese at a remote period. In the Chow Dynasty, beginning 1000 B. C., a company of Chinese settled in Borneo, and when the Portuguese discovered that island, in A. D. 1526, they were practically, though not nominally, the rulers of the island. Several other islands off the coast, such as Formosa and Celebes, have been visited by colonies of Chinese, who have been either exterminated or swallowed up. Buddhism was introduced into China in the first century, and, though a foreign religion, was not only welcomed, but was first introduced through an embassy sent by the Emperor Ming to India, who returned with some priests and images of Buddha. In the fourth century, and from that time on to the eighth, streams of pilgrims passed over the Himalayas to India, the Mecca of Buddhism, and Hindu Buddhists were in high favor in China as priests and teachers of the new religion.

We find in the writings of Marco Polo * continued evidences of the absence of the exclusive spirit which now characterizes the Chinese. During the reign of Kublai and Mongoo Khans complete toleration was granted to all religions, and honors were impartially bestowed upon men of every faith. Marco Polo was himself in high favor, though a foreigner and a Roman Catholic, and Mohammedans were numerous and freely employed. There is evidence that Christianity gained a feeble foothold in China more than a thousand years ago, and was then more favorably received than now. A stone tablet was found by the Jesuits in the seventeenth century showing the presence of Nestorian Christians in the country as early as A. D. 636, and their success in spreading Christianity; and there are imperial edicts in its favor of dates between that year and A. D. 782, which are still preserved in the archives and histories of China. We learn from the Mohammedan travelers, some of whom visited China as early as A. D. 850, that when Canton was taken and sacked by a rebel army A. D. 877, as many as 120,000 Mohammedans, Jews, Christians, and Parsees perished in the sack. These facts point to the prevalence of a far more liberal spirit than now exists.

The entire seclusion of the sovereign, and his refusal to receive foreign embassadors except on most humiliating conditions, was not so marked in the past. An embassy sent by

* See "Political and Social Condition of China, Tartary, and Thibet."—*Princip.*

Peter the Great, of Russia, in 1692, had an audience with the emperor, and partook of a banquet in his presence. The same was repeated in 1719. As late as the beginning of the present century there is an amusing account of the audience of M. Titsingh and M. Von Broam, Russian embassadors, with the old emperor, Kien Loong, who not only ate with them, but himself offered them wine.

The great wall which stretches along the northern border of China, and which is supposed to furnish proof of the existence of an exclusive spirit in the remote past, was simply a vast military fortification to keep out the wild tribes which were a terror to the whole country north of the Yang-tse-kiang. Although there may have been a national bias toward an exclusive policy, born of ignorance and conceit, yet that policy was not matured and settled till in modern times. China had little intercourse with the rest of the world, because she was shut in by natural and almost impassable barriers of mountains and deserts.

It is easy to trace the causes which led to the adoption of an exclusive policy. A history of the first two hundred years of intercourse between European nations and China is sufficient. As a whole, it is a record that for the credit of our modern civilization we might wish to leave in obscurity. But though we may wish to forget it, the Chinese nation will not. The leaders in the scenes of pillage and wanton destruction which characterized those days were the Portuguese.* We might think the accounts exaggerated did we not know of similar deeds in the intercourse of that nation and Spain with the American aborigines. A Chinese historian, putting the case very mildly, says: "They arrive in the river with ships of war, which beat our navy, sinking and burning many of our ships; they batter down our castles, taking our great men prisoners, and demean themselves altogether more like devils than men."

In 1573 the Chinese, as if to show their loathing of the strangers who had taken up their abode at Macao, built a barrier wall entirely across the isthmus on which the town stands. The Dutch early gained an almost equally unenviable reputation among the Chinese. It is a significant fact that the first known intercourse between England and China was in

* See Bowra's "History of the Quang Tung Province."

1605, when Sir E. Michelbourne, who had a patent for trading in the Eastern seas, met with and plundered several valuable Chinese junks. While the early intercourse of the English with the Chinese was not marked by such flagrant wrongs as characterized the Dutch and Spanish, yet that their deeds will not bear investigation is evident from an edict issued by the Chinese Government in 1637, strictly prohibiting all trade with them, while at the same time trade was allowed with the Dutch, provided that in every case they could give satisfactory assurance that they were not English. Whatever may have been the special part which each of these nations took in the dark transactions of those days it is certain that their combined course led directly to the policy of exclusion and non-intercourse of which we so much complain. During the last quarter of the last century and the first quarter of the present foreigners could not obtain even a temporary residence in China, except a few Romish priests, whom not even the fear of death could keep out; and, with the exception of a small colony of Chinese who left for Singapore, and the migration of persecuted Christians to Mongolia and Thibet, few Chinese left their own land.

Again we quote from Dr. Gibson, and this time with hearty concurrence:—"Even in these our days the Chinese have entered into friendly relations with other nations simply because they have been compelled to do so."—P. 29.

The incidents of the opium war, which ended in the advance on the metropolis, the sacking of the summer palace, and the treaty of Tientsin, are familiar to most readers. That treaty was ratified by the Chinese Government only when its armies were defeated, and every device that diplomacy could suggest had been exhausted. Though compelled to enter into a free intercourse with other nations, the policy of the Government has not changed.

W. H. Medhurst, Her British Majesty's Consul at Shanghai, in a recent work,* says:—

> There have been those who have asserted from high places and in authoritative style that the Chinese desire progress, and many English and American newspapers have echoed the sentiment; but it is a mistake, and those who initiated the cry too readily allowed

* "The Foreigner in Far Cathay." New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

their eyes to be blinded to the fact that it was a mistake. One has only to live among the people, to correspond and converse with the mandarins, and to study the numerous memorials addressed to the throne by leading statesmen, to convince one's self that, however much portions of the trading section of the population would like to see foreign relations extended, the ruling powers deprecate progress for its own sake. Even at the slowest rate of advance . . . the ruling and influential classes still only tolerate our presence in the country, and I firmly believe they would hail the day when they could see the last foreign factory razed to the ground, and the last ship dismissed the coast.

It might be inferred that while the ruling classes continue in this spirit no considerable emigration can take place from China. Such appears to be the conclusion of Dr. Gibson:—"Up to the present time, then, there certainly seems to be no real cause of alarm on account of the extent or rapidity of the Chinese immigration. If there is any cause for alarm, and we will not deny that there may be, the danger is entirely prospective and contingent, not present and certain."—P. 22.

But the facts will not sustain the inference, the truth being that, considering the shortness of time since the Chinese were allowed to go abroad, their almost total ignorance of other lands, and the settled opposition of the Government and ruling classes to any foreign intercourse, the emigration from China has already been large. One of the most satisfactory chapters in Dr. Gibson's book is that which treats of the number of Chinese in America. The most vague and extravagant notions have prevailed on this subject. Alarmists have not failed to make use of our ignorance, and have set its numbers at a figure which harmonized with their excited fancies. We have to thank Mr. Gibson for setting this question at rest. His data are drawn from three separate sources, which substantially agree, and may, therefore, be presumed to be correct. In 1870 Professor Porter was requested by the Bureau of Education at Washington to prepare an article on this subject. According to his statistics there were at that date less than one hundred thousand Chinese in the United States. Adding to this the number which, according to Custom-house statistics have since arrived, and deducting a fair percentage for deaths and returns to China, there remain about one hundred and fifty thousand. Again, we have statistics made up entirely from the Custom-house Records:—

TOTAL ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES FROM 1852 TO 1876.

| Year. | Arrived. | Departed. | Year. | Arrived. | Departed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1852 | 20,026 | 1,768 | 1865 | 3,095 | 2,295 |
| 1853 | 4,270 | 4,421 | 1866 | 2,242 | 3,111 |
| 1854 | 16,084 | 2,339 | 1867 | 4,290 | 4,475 |
| 1855 | 3,329 | 3,473 | 1868 | 11,081 | 4,210 |
| 1856 | 4,807 | 3,028 | 1869 | 14,990 | 4,895 |
| 1857 | 5,924 | 1,939 | 1870 | 10,870 | 4,230 |
| 1858 | 5,427 | 2,542 | 1871 | 5,540 | 3,260 |
| 1859 | 3,175 | 2,450 | 1872 | 9,770 | 4,890 |
| 1860 | 7,341 | 2,090 | 1873 | 17,075 | 6,805 |
| 1861 | 8,430 | 3,580 | 1874 | 16,085 | 7,710 |
| 1862 | 8,175 | 2,792 | 1875 | 18,021 | 6,305 |
| 1863 | 6,432 | 2,494 | 1876, first quarter. | 5,065 | 625 |
| 1864 | 2,682 | 3,910 | Total | 214,226 | 90,089 |

The number of Chinese in California before this estimate began was about ten thousand. Many have since died, and about an equal number have landed at other ports, or failed to be reported to the Custom-house authorities, which leaves the present number less than one hundred and forty thousand. Again, we have the records of the Chinese "Six Companies," according to which the number in America up to April 1, 1876, was as follows: Ning Yung Company, 75,000; Hop Wo Company, 34,000; Kong Chow Company, 15,000; Yung Wo Company, 12,000; Sam Yup Company, 11,000; Yan Wo Company, 4,300; Total, 151,300. These are all from one corner of the empire, and mainly from a single province.

The limits which the author had set in his book would not allow him to speak of the emigration of the Chinese to other countries than America. But those who have come to us are few compared with the number who have left China during the past twenty-five years. There has been a constant stream of migration southward. A recent traveler says: "To the casual observer Singapore looks more Chinese than Malayan, and really is, so as far as the population is concerned."* At Penang, in the Straits of Malacca, nearly one half the population is Chinese. They carry on most of the important branches of trade, and are the most successful traders and toilers in those islands. In Perak the tin mines are entirely in their hands. As far as the confines of India, and even in India, the Chinese are found.

They have gone to Australia in considerable numbers, where their influence is sensibly felt in the labor market. They are

* "The Land and People of China." J. Thompson, F.R.G.S.

rapidly taking the place of the vanishing Sandwich Islanders, and own and carry on some of the largest and most successful plantations in the Islands. There are six thousand Chinese residents in that little group. They have taken up their abode in parts of South America.* The Guano Islands, off the coast of Peru, are inhabited, so far as they are occupied at all, by the Chinese. In 1870† there were in the single Island of Cuba seventy thousand Chinese. It is probable that the cruelties practiced upon them in that unhappy island have reduced the number somewhat, but it is still considerable. The emigration to these various lands, which in the aggregate is not small, is but a tithe of that which has gone northward and westward into Thibet, Mongolia, Tartary, and the Russian settlements on the Amoor. Taking into account the attitude of the Chinese Government, the extreme ignorance of the masses of its people concerning other lands, and their marked partiality for their own, and, withal, the shortness of time since intercourse with modern nations really began, it is surprising that the emigration has been so large, and that it has taken so wide a range. It is prophetic, also, of the future.

Dr. Gibson says, though we shall not hold him responsible for all the meaning which we put into the passage:—"The few thousands of European and American merchants and missionaries now in China, and the one hundred and fifty thousand Chinese now in America, are but the beginnings of mighty changes about to take place in the history of that wonderfully strange people."—P. 28.

Observant men who have had opportunity to see the inner workings of Chinese society have thought that they discerned the presence of influences that are acting among the Chinese toward the same end, and in much the same manner as the silent forces in the bosom of the glacier, which push the accumulated snow of centuries down the mountain gorges out into the sea. Some of these forces have been a long time at work; others are of more recent origin, while *all* are acting with increased power from year to year.

* 197,000 had left China for that country up to 1870.

† It is difficult to see how this statement can be true, since there are records of the shipment of 130,900 Chinese to Cuba. Scarcely any are known to have returned, and it is improbable that so large a number has died. See "Chinese Immigration." Conwell, p. 92.

We propose next to speak of some of the conditions of Chinese society which point toward a large increase of emigration from that country.

Naturally enough, we consider, first, what must be the ultimate tendency of the increasing poverty of the Chinese masses. It is true, China has always been regarded as a country of great wealth. Marco Polo, in his day, brought back most extravagant tales of the almost unbounded riches of the natives of Cathay. The oft-repeated statement that China had attained to a high degree of perfection in the arts and sciences while most other nations were barbarous, has helped to perpetuate the misconception. It is but fair in making up a judgment of the circumstances of a people to have reference to the condition of the masses rather than that of the exceptional few. On this basis there can be but one opinion. Oriental lands in general are noted for the immense distance in point of wealth and station between the higher and lower classes, and China is no exception. There are princes in wealth, though their number is smaller than in western lands, while the great masses of the people are poor. The traveler who has visited the crowded cities of Europe finds on entering a Chinese city a *stratum* of society more pitiable than any he has before seen. He cannot but unfavorably contrast the condition of the peasant population with the same classes in Europe, and this whether he consider their homes, dress, food, or social surroundings. An expensive and heartless Government joins hands with corrupt systems of religion in further impoverishing the people. Moreover, poverty is on the increase. Of this there is not only abundant proof, but satisfactory explanation as to the causes.

The growing prevalence of the opium habit has had a part in the impoverishment of the people. There must be something in the constitution of the Chinese or in their climate that predisposes them to this habit, for while opium was almost unknown in that country one hundred years ago, it is now all but universal. It has been estimated that among Government officials forty per cent. are opium smokers, twenty per cent. of the merchants, seventy or eighty per cent. of the attendants of mandarins, and fifty per cent. of the fighting soldiery.

A Jesuit priest, who, in 1856, when opium smoking was less common than now, passed from Thibet directly through China,

said: "During the whole of the journey we met with but one tribunal where opium was not smoked openly and with impunity." It is asserted that there is an opium shop in the imperial palace at Peking, at the very foot of the Dragon Throne. Whatever may be said as to the influence of this habit in the direction of health and morals—and there are conflicting opinions—none can doubt that it is a costly vice. Large cities abound in victims of this habit, who have been reduced from at least comfortable circumstances to want and beggary. There is a single port on the Yang-tse-kiang river where three days out of every week there are landed one hundred and thirty chests of India opium, each chest valued at about six hundred and fifty dollars.* When we consider that this two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per week must be drawn from men who receive on an average fifteen cents for a day's labor, many of whom, having once become victims of the habit, must have means for its gratification at any sacrifice, we can understand the misery which follows in the wake of this trade. The Government derives a large revenue from the duties on opium, but it is at the expense of making paupers of many of the people.

Much of the destitution among the people may be traced to the series of bloody uprisings and rebellions which have followed one another in rapid succession during the last twenty-five years. The history of the Tai-ping rebellion, which, starting among the mountains of Kwang Tung, in 1850, spread like a consuming fire over all the southern and central provinces, has yet to be written. Enough is now known to establish the fact that it was one of the most sanguinary civil wars of which we have any knowledge. The chief theater of the war was the valley of the Yang-tse-kiang, which is the heart and garden of the empire. The rebel and imperial forces passed up and down this beautiful valley like hordes of devouring locusts, though, unlike them, destroying what they could not eat, always leaving behind them ruined cities, depopulated districts, and barren wastes. It is estimated that thirty millions of the inhabitants were either slain in battle or perished in the famine

* This was the case in 1870, since which time there has been a decrease in the amount of opium imported on account of the increased cultivation of the poppy and enlarged production of opium in the western provinces of China.

that followed on the heels of the war. The loss of life was exceeded only by the incalculable destruction of property.

An English traveler,* passing up the valley some years subsequent to the close of the war, says of Nankin—and the same may be said of scores of other cities:—

> Ten years after this dreadful episode Nankin was yet in ruins. Acres upon acres of streets, once busy and teeming with thousands of industrious citizens, stretched out within the walls like grass mounds, hushed, desolate, and overgrown with rank weeds. Here and there faint, as if still pursued by dark memories, the hum of reawakening life might be heard, mingled with the fitful sounds of laborers and builders at the task of reconstructing. Outside, the deserted plains, where little else but reeds and grass were to be seen, testified how completely the region had been depopulated. Fresh laborers had begun to pour in, and were settling like squatters on a new land.

The same author adds, concerning a city altogether unknown to the western world:—

> Another instance of the havoc made by the Tai-ping rebellion is afforded by the city of Chung Chow, in the Fukien Province, and an instance by no means exceptional, as the ravages of the war extended far and wide all over the central provinces. It is stated on good authority that when Chung Chow fell into the hands of the rebels from six to seven hundred thousand men were killed or perished by disease.

The Tai-ping rebellion, which continued for fifteen years, was followed by the Mohammedan uprising in the North-west Provinces, which has not yet been quelled. Our information on this point is very limited; but whether the rebel or imperial forces have the mastery, the people must suffer. Civil war has existed in some part of China for thirty years. Some provinces are in a chronic state of rebellion, while others are infested by bands of followers of the "lost cause," who vent their spite by plundering villages and hamlets.

Many of the people have been shut out from their former means of gaining a livelihood, or had their income greatly curtailed through the introduction of foreign machinery and foreign goods. This fact the Chinese themselves state in an appeal to the citizens of San Francisco, wherein they say:—

> It is but fair to state that as much friction, if not more, is caused in China by the presence of foreigners than the Chinese are cre-

* J. Thompson, F.R.G.S., in "Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China," p. 85.

ating in this land. The declaimers against us because we supplant white laborers in this country ought to know, what is well known to all intelligent Chinamen, that the introduction of American and English steamers upon the rivers and coasts of China has thrown out of business a vast fleet of junks, and out of employment a whole army of men, larger in number than all the Chinese now in America.

The same is true of the introduction of foreign goods. Single-handed industry can never compete with machinery in either the quality of an article or its cost. If a Chinaman can buy a beautifully polished knife from the Sheffield works of England cheaper than a rough tool turned out on his neighbor's anvil, or a yard of cloth from English manufactories cheaper than from his neighbor, the weaver, he will certainly do so. W. H. Seward, in summing up the civilization of China, says: "Chinese industries proscribe invention." But Chinese thrift leads them to buy when it can be done to the best advantage. Western nations are taking advantage of this fact to dispose of their surplus of manufactured goods. A glance at the trade of China for the last twenty years will show that it has largely increased in both imports and exports, with this difference, that while the exports have been mainly commodities which do not come into competition with industries in the lands to which they are sent, the imports are largely of manufactured goods which come into competition with local industries. Hence the foreign trade is looked upon by many of the Chinese as a calamity, and, doubtless, it does result in deprivation and poverty in many quarters. These and many other causes are increasing the financial burdens of the people, and as the path across the sea becomes more and more known to them, will aid in sending large numbers of them abroad.

Another influence acting toward an increased emigration of the Chinese proceeds from the unsatisfactory political condition of the country, and the oppressions of the Government. On few subjects have such widely different things been written as concerning the Government of China. Some have seen in it a model Government, and have lauded it to the skies; others have been as loud in condemnation of its weakness and oppression. Both parties are correct, for one describes the theory of the Government as it is on the statute books, the other its practice. The theory of the Government and its code of laws

are such as to have awakened the admiration of the best statesmen of both England and America. The Government is patriarchal, and the laws, on the whole, are humane and just. The greatest care seems to have been taken to guard the people from oppression on the part of subordinates. As a *stimulus* and token of confidence in the people, the officers of Government are supposed to be invariably chosen from the graduates of the Imperial College, which is open to the poorest. To still further guard against corruption, no officer of rank can marry or hold office in his native province, and should not employ a relative in any position under him; and a magistrate is seldom kept in one position more than four years. The theory is a most excellent one: it has held the nation together and given it a lease of life far beyond that enjoyed by any other nation.

But when we come to the practical workings of the Government we must bate our admiration not a little. We must remember that it is a country vast as our own, and yet without telegraphs, railroads, and, till lately, without steamboats on its coast and rivers. The capital is situated in the northern corner of the empire, and when the laws get a thousand miles away they lose their authority. The people are practically in the hands of subordinate rulers, who, with small salaries, live like princes, and, if called to account for their oppressions of the people, depend on their distance from the capital and the venality of higher officers to help them out of the difficulty. Indeed, official corruption is a sort of recognized and well understood fact, arising partly from the inadequate pay of the mandarins, and partly from the mode of collecting and administering the revenue. A petty officer freely stated to Mr. Meadows that, though his legal income was but little more than one hundred dollars, yet his position was worth upward of ten thousand dollars. A court of justice in China is notoriously devoid of even a show of justice. The culprit brought for trial appears before the judge on his knees, and, without counsel to represent the case, or jury before whom to be tried, receives his sentence. A Chinaman dreads a summons before a court as he does a fearful sickness, and, whether right or wrong, knows that the easiest way out of the difficulty is by bribery. The same corruption exists in the administration of the affairs

of the Imperial College. Promotion is supposed to be had only on the ground of merit, the test of which is the production of a literary composition on the day of examination. Yet it is a notorious fact that degrees are now often conferred upon those who have not been at the examination, but have bought their way to position.

The history of one of the score or more of Chinese dynasties which in turn have ruled the people is the history of them all. They began in the direction of integrity and reform, but declined year by year, ending in corruption and misrule. The Tartar Dynasty has run its course, and reached its latter stages.* If the emperor be, as he is styled, Father of the People, he is a most heartless and unnatural one, or else is pitiably weak. In the famines, floods, pestilences, and local disturbances which have so frequently occurred among that unhappy people, the Government has rendered no substantial aid. One of the representatives of our Church in China, in a recent letter, says:—

> The famine in Shan-tung has destroyed many thousands, and is now followed by a pestilential fever that is carrying off thousands more. Locusts are devastating portions of Kiang-si, Ho-nan, Nganhwei, and other provinces. Great floods have done immense damage at Canton. The air in every direction seems heavily laden with calamitous tidings.

The attitude of the Government toward these sufferers is well described by Medhurst:—

> The supreme Government and local authorities at such conjunctures profess great concern for the sufferings of the people, and measures are set on foot at times on an extensive scale to organize schemes for relief, but inefficiency and corruption nearly always interfere to defeat the most beneficent intentions, and little or nothing is eventually effected beyond the bestowal, by imperial favor, of a new tablet upon a river god, or the offering of a special sacrifice to propitiate some deity supposed to be offended.

No sufficient protection is given the people against the robbers who, under the cloak of insurrection, infest many of the

* Traces are every-where to be seen upon the great thoroughfares of the elaborately constructed highways of better days, but they are now mere broken tracks, obstructed throughout much of their course by the very stones which once constituted the source of utility and beauty. Bridges, too, many of them admirable as works of art, and others curious from their rough and massive character, span wide and rapid streams, but, like every thing else in China, tell the same sad story of past energy and present decay.—*Medhurst.*

provinces. The imperial troops are as much an object of dread to the people as those whom they are sent to oppose. They have no sufficient means of support themselves, and must live on the people, who, rather than apply for help from that source, choose to suffer on in silence. Taking it altogether, we do not see how China can evade the charge of being the worst governed country in the world.* Oppression has often had a hand in scattering a people, as a history of the tyrannies of Europe will show, and when the door now closed by ignorance is fairly opened to the Chinese, it will not fail to do the same work there.

The religious condition of China is such that, though taken in itself its influence might be small, yet, when other influences take the lead, it will help to swell the number who take refuge abroad. Three great religious systems hold the Chinese mind in slavery, namely, those of Confucius, Buddha, and Lao-tse. With the exception of the *literati*, who are Confucianists, the people are not followers of any one of these religions, but have an eclectic system made up of elements from each. From the Confucian system they have borrowed that which has grown up alongside of it, the worship of ancestors; from the Buddhist a modified idea of transmigration of soul, and a large number of gods, and some humanitarian precepts; and from the Tauist most of all that is dark and mysterious in that system. Whatever may be said of these systems, and they each contain much that is excellent and true, the religious condition of the Chinese masses is most deplorable. As a whole, their strange compound of a religion appeals only to the element of fear. Their worship is, for the most part, a mere propitiation of angry gods and spirits. Superstition has a fair field among such a people, and does not fail to do its direful work. The result is an uneasy condition of society,† which inevitably tends

* See Williams' "Middle Kingdom," vol. i, p. 396.

† A letter, of which the following is an extract, was written by a Chinaman in California in reply to the question why the Chinese went abroad. It is given in the imperfect form in which it was written: "The difficulty which our king (we call him Woongtu in China) has with this part of our people is because they cannot understand. They think they have bad time in China, and some Nykoos (nuns) tells them there will come a famine soon time, and they frighten at it and say, 'How can we live? We have much family, and no rice, no fish.' Then they hear that they can come to this country and get pay. So they come. They think some time business will be better and the famine gone. Then in China they get strange ideas that make them uneasy and want to go away. They expect to see

to increase the power and importance of whatever movements arise among the people.

J. Thompson, F. R. G. S., a veteran English traveler, closes an exceedingly interesting book on "The Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China," with the following sentences:—

> The picture, at best, is a sad one, and though a ray of sunlight may brighten it here and there, yet, after all, the darkness that broods over the land becomes but the more palpable under the struggling, fitful light. Poverty and ignorance we have among us in England, but no poverty so wretched, no ignorance so intense, as is found among the millions of China.

Such are some of the conditions of Chinese society which furnish a basis for the belief in an increase of Chinese emigration.

On the supposition that such an exodus is possible, and even probable, let us consider the grounds, if any exist, for the fear that has taken possession of so many minds lest we should be overwhelmed in what may be a second "Barbarian Irruption."

The reasons alleged in justification of the cry against Chinese immigration are the numbers of that people, and our inability to support large numbers or supply them with labor. Objections are also brought against the character of the people as immoral and vicious, and against their civilization as barbarous, also against their religions as tending to corrupt our purer Christianity. It is obvious that if any valid objections exist, they must be either on account of the character of the immigrants or their numbers.

As to the fear that we shall be overwhelmed by mere numbers, it has its origin largely in the imagination. Movements among any Oriental people must be necessarily slow. Means of communication among the people are very imperfect. Light penetrates the masses very tardily. The people as a whole know little of their own country out of their native province,

in China all slaves and no rice at all, which would be sad. They tell me strange stories about their seeing Buddha with a great sword from horizon to horizon, and that they find blood in the clothes when they wash, and that they see China sometimes in the sky with a great smoke under it. All much fearful, and so they don't go back when ready. They ask the shang-shang, (god,) and he wont say yes or no, so they think he don't want to tell. You must not think any thing of it, for they are poor and not knowing. I cannot think many of them here came because they not liked China. They want money, and a place where they do not frighten."—*Conwell, Chinese Immigration, p.* 42.

much less of lands beyond the sea. And, unless such a famine should visit China as was felt in Ireland in 1846, which so greatly stimulated emigration from that country—a supposition that is extremely improbable because of the variety of the resources of China—no such overwhelming numbers may be expected.

But should the expectations of the most fearful be realized, the result would still be not an unmixed evil. In that event it is probable that the tides of emigration would set toward the same lands that have already been occupied by small numbers, namely, North and South America, Australia, the Sandwich Islands, the East Indies, and the countries bordering on China toward the north and west.

Let us inquire as to the ability of those countries to support a larger population than they now contain.

As to the United States, we quote from Dr. Townsend, who refers us to Rev. Joseph Cook as his authority:—

> The extent of the arable soil of the United States transcends conception. It is more than that of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined. It is so immense that should China empty her five hundred millions of people upon our shores, (of which there is no danger,) we could still find room for more; according to the estimates of those who have given attention to these matters, our country has ample capacity for thirty-six hundred millions of human beings, a number five times greater than the present population of the globe. Who are we, therefore, that we should block our ports, put down fence posts, and interdict immigration to these favorite and vast domains?

The center of this vast area is practically uninhabited. Texas, with an area of 237,500 square miles, has a population of a million; Washington Territory, with 70,000 square miles, has only one inhabitant to every two square miles, while its vast regions are occupied only by the buffalo and the Indian. Most of the Western States and Territories have issued at public expense works descriptive of the resources of their several sections, which need only an industrious population to develop into mines of wealth. Many of them have appointed agents to secure immigration to their respective States. From whence are the people to come to cultivate these vast regions? The immigration from Europe has almost ceased.* Unless there be an

* The Catholic World, July, 1877, in an article on the European Exodus, says: "The great wave of immigration began to rise in 1840, reached its highest point

influx of patient toilers from the Orient, the next half century will find these resources yet undeveloped.

South America has an area of 6,600,000 square miles, and a population of less than twenty millions of people. Most of that vast region is yet virgin soil. The people are not over-industrious, and the resources of the country not much more developed than they were a quarter of a century ago. There is little reason to look for greater progress in the future. We can imagine the change that would come over that land should Providence send there in large numbers that people whose name is a synonym for industry and thrift.

Australia has an area of three millions of square miles, and a population of little more than one million. The interior, for the most part, has never even been explored. It lacks but one element to insure its becoming a great country and nation, and that need is people of industrious habits.

The Sandwich Islands are too small to be taken into the account when speaking of such vast countries as America and Australia; but, small as they are, they seem destined to become the future abode of many thousands of Chinese, who are taking the place of the vanishing native race.

Thibet, Tartary, and Mongolia, while not so fertile, are less distant, and will continue to furnish homes for hundreds of thousands of Chinese in the future as they have done in the past.

No doubt, in the event of a large immigration to any of these countries, there would be some friction, and some classes for the time being would be inconvenienced and suffer loss; but, looking at the subject simply from an industrial stand-point, no loss would be sustained by the world in general, or the Anglo-Saxon race in particular.

Stronger objections to the immigration of the Chinese are supposed to exist on the ground of the evil effects that will ensue on the introduction of a large heathen element into any of these countries.

in 1869–72, and, notwithstanding some fluctuations, continued to bring to our shores a colony a day until 1875. In that year it experienced a sudden and serious check, and has ever since steadily subsided, until now it has not only sunk to a low water-mark, but has seemed to be about to flow the other way. . . . The whole number of steerage emigrants from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland which landed at New York during the year was 20,064, a much smaller number than arrived in any previous year since 1840.

Dr. John Foster, in his volume of admirable essays, refers to the frequency with which men apply epithets to classes of persons against whom they are prejudiced, epithets of which the users would be at a loss to explain the meaning were they called upon to do so. He says in the way of illustration :—

Puritan was doubtless welcomed as a term most luckily invented or revived when it began to be applied in contempt to a class of men of whom the world was not worthy. Its odd peculiarity gave it almost such an advantage as that of a proper name among the lumber of common words by which they were described and reviled; while yet it meant any thing, every thing, which the vain world disliked in the devout and conscientious character. . . . The vain and malignant spirit which had decried the elevated piety of the Puritans, sought about for some convenient form in which it might again come forth to hiss at zealous Christianity, and in another lucky moment fell on the term *Methodist*. If there is no *sense* in the word as now applied, there seems, however, to be a good deal of aptitude and execution. It has the advantage of being comprehensive as a general denomination, and yet opprobrious as a special badge for every thing that ignorance and folly may mistake for fanaticism or that malice may willfully assign to it. Whenever a formalist feels it his duty to sneer at those operations of religion on the passions by which he has never been disturbed, he has only to call them *Methodistical;* and though the word be so trite and so vague, he feels as if he had uttered a good, pungent thing. There is a satirical smartness in the word, though there be none in the man. In default of keen faculty in the mind, it is delightful thus to find something that will do as well ready bottled up in odd terms.

The same remarks are applicable with reference to the use of the word *heathen*, which means, in the root, one who lives in the country, or on the heaths. In somewhat of the same spirit of the Jew, who called all except his own people Gentiles, or the Mohammedan, who applied the epithet *infidel*, to all except followers of the Koran, we have used the term *heathen*. In the sense of not being acquainted with revealed religion, and of accepting very tardily offers of Christian light and instruction, the Chinese are certainly heathen. But when the word is meant to cover the charge of groveling vice and degradation, such as would pollute our civilization by its very touch, it is a misnomer.* The writer of the introduction to Dr. Gib-

* Father Huchard, the most prominent Jesuit priest on the Pacific coast, said in an address concerning the Chinese: "These pagan, these vicious, these immoral creatures, that are incapable of rising to the virtue that is inculcated by the religion of Jesus Christ, the world's Redeemer."

son's book remarks of the author: "I am inclined to think that he has drawn the faults of the pagan strangers a little more strongly than their virtues." The same statement may be made with reference to the light in which the entire heathen world has been portrayed to the nations of Christendom in the past. Men have persisted in looking at pagan nations through the glass of the first chapter of the Book of Romans. And since one can see almost any thing among a people if he sets out with a preconceived opinion, and a resolution to preserve it intact, our missionaries in the past have seen among the heathen mainly vices. But juster and more impartial views are beginning to prevail. We are coming to see in the first chapter of Romans a description of every heart by nature.* We are coming to admit not only that the heathen have the guide of conscience and reason, but also that the Spirit of grace is not confined to so-called Christian lands, but "lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and that it is possible that some fruit of the Spirit may be found amid the darkness of heathenism. We are coming to look with at least a little favor on such statements as the following, made by one who was for two years a resident at the Court of Siam:—

> I was thankful to find even in this citadel of Buddhism men and, above all, women who were lovely in their lives; who amid infinite difficulties in the bosom of corrupt society, and enslaved to a capricious and often cruel will, yet devoted themselves to an earnest search after truth. On the other hand, I have to confess, with sorrow and shame, how far we, with all our boasted enlightenment, fall short in true nobility and piety of some of our benighted sisters of the East. With many of them love, truth, and wisdom are not mere synonyms, but *living gods*, for whom they long, with lively ardor, and, when found. embrace with joy.†

The sooner we disabuse our minds of the impression that in dealing with the heathen world we are dealing with a state of society utterly degraded, where moral obligation is nothing, and where impurity causes no blush, and awakens no condemnation, the sooner we shall rightly estimate the true condition of those to whom our missionaries are sent. It is generally the case, when the limits of truth have been exceeded in the statement of any subject, in the recoil which ultimately fol-

* See Introduction to Cocker's "Christianity in the Greek Philosophy."

† "English Governors at the Court of Siam," by Mrs. Leonowens.

lows the bounds of truth are again transgressed, though in the opposite direction. We notice such a tendency in current estimates of heathen society and civilization. Ethnic religions are the objects of special praise in some quarters, and heathen civilization is deemed of great excellence. As usual, *in medio tutissimus ibis.* The impartial student of pagan religions, as well as the unbiased traveler in the lands where they prevail, will find much to condemn, and something to praise. In its moral and social aspects, heathen society is to many a matter of surprise. We recently asked of one who for the last ten years has resided in the heart of one of the largest of so-called heathen cities the following question: "How does the society of the city in which you have lived in its moral aspects compare with our own?" His reply, which was given after deliberation, was as follows: "Very favorably. There are not so many murders or suicides, no more thefts, and those generally on a small scale, no drunkenness, and not so much licentiousness, in that city as your own." That judgment, formed not by a flying visit, but by years of observation, is the verdict of not a few of those who live within the bounds of heathendom. Exception may be made as to parts of Africa, Australia, and some of the islands of the Pacific; but of India, the Malayan Peninsula, China, and Japan, which represent immense territories, and more than one half the race, the above statement is true. It would be easy to gather testimony from such men as the Abbé Huc, Captain Forbes, who resided eleven years in Ceylon, Vincent,* author of the Land of the White Elephant, as well as a host of cousular agents, merchants, and missionaries. Consul Medhurst, in a work already referred to, says: "Indeed, were I asked to state candidly in which part of the world I thought the effects of vicious indulgences are more outwardly observable, socially speaking, I certainly should not name China."

Not only has the heathen world improved on a better acquaintance, but China, in which we are most directly interested, is the best part of that world. The institutions of China will compare favorably with those of any non-christian country.

* This author makes the following statement of the city of Bangkok, which has a population of 400,000: "Thefts are not so frequent here as in England, and cases of murder so seldom that for a year sometimes there will not be one."

The Government of China, though now a sorry sight under the waning power of the Manchoos, yet as a whole, and especially during the past, stands out in marked contrast with those of other pagan nations. Religion in China is devoid of those revolting features which too often characterize heathen systems. The Chinese as a people will compare favorably with either the Hindus, Birmese, Siamese, or Japanese. Though not such adepts in misty speculation as the first, or so enthusiastic over every thing new and foreign as the last, yet, in all the elements necessary to make up a steady, sober, and industrious people, just such as the vast undeveloped resources of the western world need, they excel. Dr. Gibson says:—

> History teaches the impossibility of continuing in *statu quo* for a long period two distinct and often conflicting forms of civilization under one and the same government, in the same country, and at the same time. Constant contact, mutual friction, a better acquaintance with each other, always modifies the point of difference, and tends gradually to bring the two distinct forms of civilization into one. The tendency of the lower, according to its measure of power, is to corrupt, weaken and poison the higher and better; while it is the tendency of the higher and better, according to its measure of power, to arouse, vitalize, energize, purify, and uplift the lower and decaying.—P. 126.

We believe that when that day comes, when the paths across the ocean are better known to the people of the Orient, and thousands more of them escape from the poverty, the bondage and tyrannies of those old lands, as fifty years ago men did from Europe, Christianity will be found true to herself and her past record, and, as the "higher and better," which she unquestionably is, will "arouse, vitalize, energize, purify, and uplift the lower and decaying."

## Art. V.—THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN POLITICS.

The great nation known as the United States of America was originally established by the offspring of rare and cultured families, gathered from different parts of Europe, who were imbued with purest principles, and were wise far above their fellows in political knowledge. The oft-repeated assertion, "They

builded wiser than they knew," is an exceedingly questionable one. In those days the ablest men of the provinces sat in the public councils, and their writings and debates prove that they had thoroughly studied the science of government, and foresaw in an unusual degree the consequences of their action. In Europe society had long groaned under an excess of government; the founders of the new nation resolved to give it as little government as possible. All the monarchies of the ages had practiced more or less of despotism; all the republics and confederations had been so feebly constructed as to tempt anarchy, which had proved the ruin of most of them. The military struggles of our Revolutionary fathers were not half so distinguished as their moral achievements in the origination of a new and peerless system of national administration. Their armies were not great nor their bravery conspicuous. Their success in the field sprang from geographical location, the support of powerful allies, and a favoring Providence. But while the country was poor in military education and equipments, it was rich in the principles of human liberty, and in that rare wisdom needful to mold them into appropriate legislative and administrative forms. The government of the country, as well as its settlement, began in the townships, and expanded gradually into cities and States, which were at length grouped into a federal union. The principles of "State sovereignty" were cultivated legitimately, therefore, before the federal nation existed, and they have lived to somewhat disturb the national tranquility through its first century.

The close of the war for independence in 1783 found the thirteen colonies impoverished to bankruptcy, and utterly disjointed and chaotic in government. The federal league, adopted in 1778, was an indifferent bond of union during the war, and fell hopelessly in pieces on the cessation of hostilities. The Continental Congress kept up a kind of existence, but was powerless as an agent of government. Its members failed to attend, and its acts were inoperative in the States until approved by the Legislatures of the States, seven of which must concur before any of its measures were valid. When the public danger was removed by the withdrawal of the British troops, the revenues were withheld by the States, and the dwindling Congress, as a central government, was paralyzed. It had

and could secure no income to liquidate the public debt, or pay its interest. Its securities depreciated to less than a tenth of their nominal value, and its soldiers were unpaid. America was at last free, but she had neither respect abroad nor tranquillity at home. Great Britain intercepted her lucrative trade with the West Indies, Spain resisted her right to navigate the Mississippi, while in the Mediterranean and adjacent waters her ships were plundered by the pirates of Algiers. Indian depredations were common along her frontiers. Jealousies between the States, lack of confidence attending the financial prostration, and widespread dissatisfaction, culminating in Shay's rebellion, aroused the statesmanship of the country. To organize for internal and external protection became an imperative necessity. The several colonies were invited by the Legislature of Virginia to send representatives to a general convention, and in May, 1787, the fifty-five chosen delegates convened in Philadelphia, where they continued until September in secret session, with George Washington as President, and matured what has since been known as the "Constitution of the United States of America." This Constitution, adopted by the States in 1789, has since received fifteen amendments.

The newly organized American Government began its modest career under the eyes of friendly and hostile critics, who uttered nearly every variety of hope and prediction concerning it. Hamilton, one of the chief agents in its formation, a great statesman, and a friend of a strong Government, thought the present form too weak, but as he could carry the country no further he accepted it, with misgivings. Jefferson, the greatest and best Democrat of the century, thought the system adopted too strong, and lived in continual horror of an incoming monarchy. For many years the factions in the nation followed substantially the lead of these two men. Washington was inaugurated President on April 30, 1789, on the balcony of the old City Hall, New York, near which he took up his modest residence, and proceeded to cautiously organize and administer the Government. Hamilton was appointed Secretary of the Treasury; Jefferson, Secretary of State; Knox, Secretary of War; Edmund Randolph, Attorney General; and John Jay, Chief-Justice of the United States. Every thing was new, and the greatest discretion was required to introduce, without fric-

tion, the principles and machinery of a strong central authority. The first Congress, which convened in January, 1790, found it incumbent to provide for national defense; to facilitate intercourse and commerce with foreign nations; to adopt a system of weights and measures, and a postal system; to encourage manufactures, agriculture, and education; to establish a currency; and last, though not least, to provide for the maintenance of the public credit. To this last measure, which most embarrassed the country, and was most difficult to handle, Washington had pledged his administration previous to his election. The Continental Congress had enjoyed the power of contracting debts, but held no control of the resources of the country to liquidate them. At the close of the Revolution the war debt amounted to forty-two millions, but this, through arrears of interest, etc., had increased to upward of fifty-four millions. Of this amount, eight millions were due to France, between three and four millions to private capitalists in Holland, two hundred and fifty thousand to some Spanish gentlemen, making about twelve millions due abroad. Forty-two millions were due at home to officers and privates of the army, and to farmers, manufacturers, and capitalists, who had patriotically risked life and fortune in the struggle for independence. Besides this general indebtedness, about twenty-five millions more were owed by the States, (half of that amount having been incurred by Massachusetts, Virginia, and South Carolina,) expended also in the common defense. Hamilton proposed that the Federal Government assume the entire war debt, and provide for its interest and liquidation. This very reasonable and only feasible method produced an intense political uproar, shaking the national fabric for an entire year, and threatening the dismemberment of the newly formed Union, and was the first great strain on our governmental system. After much debate and threatening, (the latter greatly mortifying Washington,) the measure passed by a small majority, under a compromise for the removal of the capital southward. The conclusion reached in that early crisis lifted the Federal Government into great prominence, and settled forever its competency to provide for national indebtedness, and to regulate finance. The funding of the war debt was the chief feature of Washington's first term. His second term brought its chapters of anxiety and mortification,

even greater than the first. He had been re-elected by the unanimous vote of the Electoral College, and felt not a little flattered by his continued popularity. The Revolution in France was already in progress; every mail brought an account of the fall of towns and the murder of citizens. The intelligence of the decapitation of Louis XVI. and of a declaration of war with England brought popular excitement in America to its highest pitch. Multitudes were ready to rush into war with England in the interests of France. Washington clearly perceived that in a foreign war America had nothing to gain, but much to lose. He, therefore, hastily convened his cabinet, and arranged a proclamation which he accompanied with measures of strict neutrality. But a few weeks after his second inauguration "Citizen Genet," the young Jacobin from the French Republic, landed at Charleston with three hundred blank commissions for privateers, which he began to distribute clandestinely to adventurous seamen. He was tardy in presenting his credentials to the Government, and, notwithstanding its proclamation, continued to send out vessels of war. He organized *Jacobin* clubs, sought to incite war between the people of the Southern States and the Spaniards of Louisiana, and, when remonstrated with by cabinet officials for these examples of misdemeanor, denounced the policy of the Government, and threatened to appeal from the President to the people. On Washington's demand the French Government promptly recalled him. But the populace here sided with Genet during that entire summer, to the infinite mortification of the President, who, in one of his cabinet meetings, lost all self-control, and declared that he would rather be in his grave than in his present position, adding that he had never repented but once his re-election, and that had been every moment since he consented to continue in office.

A treaty formed with Great Britain during this term also excited the wildest opposition, subjecting the President to nearly as great popular obloquy as any of his successors has ever been compelled to encounter. His national fame and great firmness held the warring factions together until the hour of reason returned. With a President less famous or practical the Republic would have stranded.

The administration of John Adams was a stormy one, grow-

ing out of the disturbed state of Europe, and of political jealousies at home, but it was not in any large sense an educating period to the American people. The seat of the National Government was removed to Washington, and the whole Federal party went into a hopeless decline, and virtually expired with his official term. The Democratic or State Rights party, headed by Jefferson, assumed control of the country on the elevation of their chief to the Presidency. Washington expired near the close of Adams's administration, and Hamilton was killed in a duel during Jefferson's first term, depriving the Federal party of its chief advisers and ornaments. Jefferson, while out of office, had lived in horror of the executive authority, and it is amusing to see how marvelously his views were modified when he came to administer the government. The abstract theories of individual and State rights he had so long advocated he appeared to find utterly untenable in practice. Instead of leaving Burr to the legal tribunal, he threw his entire official influence against him in his trial, and even counseled the indictment of his legal adviser as an accomplice. Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana was a magnificent stroke for the rising nation. The territory thus acquired for fifteen millions amounted to over nine hundred and thirty thousand square miles, and more than doubled the area of what was then the United States. But he had no authority as the Executive to make the purchase, and would have been appalled at such a stretch of power in other hands. The political education of the nation was, however, much advanced under Jefferson. The trial of Burr was a wholesome and far-reaching lesson to political chieftains; and the growing sentiment against the iniquitous African slave-trade crystallized into appropriate legislation for its suppression.

During the administration of President Madison came the short war with Algiers, and the second war with Great Britain, which latter cost the country thirty thousand lives, and one hundred millions of money; but, besides establishing our equality on the ocean, it did more for the military education of the nation than all the campaigns of the Revolution. The internal advantages to the American people growing out of that war were also of far greater importance than the concessions obtained from surrounding nations. Suspension of inter-

course with Europe stimulated domestic manufactures, and bequeathed to America the immense mill power of New England. That period settled also, as never before, the war power of the Federal Government. President Madison was not a soldier, and, as the country was destitute of both army and navy, he leaned to pacific measures, and hesitated long under British encroachments before deciding on armed resistance. War at length became inevitable. The country was large and feebly defended, and portions of it soon fell a prey to the enemy. New England, particularly, suffered in the destruction of her commerce and fisheries, and the wide-spread inroads upon her territory. Her people, too, were generally Federalists, and regarded the war as an ill-advised and unwarranted party measure of the Democrats. This led to the famous Hartford Convention of 1814, which arraigned the general Government for usurpation, in that it claimed power over the militia of the country, and the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by conscription, and in that it employed the revenue gathered in New England for the defense of other portions of the country. News concerning the negotiations for peace at Ghent reached the country soon after the adjournment of the Convention, and ended the practical discussion of these questions for that time. The Hartford Convention and its adherents fell into national disrepute, (its members being almost wholly excluded from political preferment,) and the war power of the Federal Government has never since been seriously questioned.

A new chapter in American politics opened about the year 1820. The long wars of the French Revolution, and the war with England, just mentioned, cutting off for years all free communication with Europe, gave rise to extensive manufactories in the Northern States. When peace was concluded the channels of international commerce were re-opened, and the fabrics of Europe sought the American market. To protect the incipient manufactures of the States, and also to provide revenue for the liquidation of the national indebtedness, a system of import duties was established by the Federal Government. This important measure, considered thoroughly statesmanlike at the North, was stoutly resisted at the South, which was devoted exclusively to agricultural pursuits. As early as 1820 South Carolina, in a petition to Congress, declared that the

tariff was "unconstitutional, oppressive, and unjust," and at subsequent periods North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and Virginia, joined in the remonstrance. During the summer of 1828 John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, then Vice-President of the United States, propounded the doctrine of *Nullification*, namely, the right of each State to prevent the execution within its limits of such acts of Congress as it might deem unconstitutional. In a speech in the United States Senate, in 1833, Mr. Calhoun uttered the following, which briefly presents the foundation for his entire theory: "The Constitution is a compact to which the States were parties in their sovereign capacity: now, whenever a contract is entered into by parties which acknowledge no tribunal above their authority to decide in the last resort, each of them has a right to judge for itself in relation to the nature, extent, and obligations of the instrument." This was substantially the principle of the old confederations, that had ruined so many republics, and which the framers of the Constitution had so carefully shunned in organizing the new nation. The Democratic party, save the South Carolina wing headed by Calhoun, supported President Jackson and the protective tariff. In 1832 the Legislature of South Carolina resolved to carry out its theory of nullification; to this end it armed the militia, and prepared for war. Jackson issued a proclamation declaring his purpose to collect the revenues in that State, and called upon Congress for some special legislation in the case. The storm was averted by the compromise bill introduced by Mr. Clay, which provided for the gradual reduction of the revenue, and the abandonment of the protective system at the end of ten years. The surrender on the part of the Federal Government in this instance was far too marked, and only flattered that spirit of State arrogance that burst forth thirty years later in a bloody civil war. The remarkable discussion on the subject, however, in the United States Senate, between Mr. Calhoun and Daniel Webster, the two profoundest men of the time, and the most remarkable representatives of Northern and Southern statesmanship, laying open every principle of our government, and exhausting every thread of argument, constitutes one of the most brilliant chapters in American politics. The lapse of nearly fifty years has not dimmed

the radiance of that period. The firmness of President Jackson, also, has ever been commended, and the authority of the Federal Government on all matters of tariff every-where acknowledged.

The doctrine of State Rights never took deep root in the Northern section of the Union, but continued popular in the South, cultivating in that section the spirit of disunion which finally culminated in the slaveholders' rebellion. The great battle covering the last half century of American history, taxing the intellect, the heart, and finally the purse, of the entire people, has been between the adherents of *slave* and of *free* labor. Slavery was here before the organization of the Governments of the States, and at the period of the Revolution the antislavery sentiment prevailed quite as generally at the South as in the North. The ordinance of 1787, excluding the institution from the North-Western territory, was chiefly supported by Southern men, and in 1798 Georgia prohibited the importation of slaves into the State. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, and, indeed, most of the leading statesmen at the formation of the Government, looked to the early emancipation of the slaves. After the organization of the Government the work of emancipation proceeded briskly in the Eastern and Middle States. Vermont abolished the system before entering the Union. Massachusetts (which then included Maine) did the same in 1780, as did also Pennsylvania by gradual emancipation, Connecticut and Rhode Island taking similar action. In 1804 New Jersey passed laws for the gradual release of her twelve thousand bondmen, and in 1827, the period of gradual emancipation adopted by New York, set free the last of her twenty thousand. That the spirit of emancipation did not prevail in the South is to be attributed to a variety of causes, but principally to the nature of its soil, climate, and productions, which soon rendered slave labor lucrative, and also to the Southern ideal of social life, which was reckoned genteel, chivalric, baronial.

The cotton plant was indigenous to the South. Cotton had been cultivated and manufactured in Mexico and Peru before the arrival of Columbus, but the labor of preparing it for market was so enormous that it made no perceptible addition to the world's commerce until after the American Revolution. Two

great inventions about that period were destined to bring this commodity into world-wide use, and to largely revolutionize the industry and commerce of the nations. The labor of separating the cotton from the seed was so difficult that not more than one pound per day could be prepared by a laborer; but in 1793 Eli Whitney, a New England inventor, produced the cotton gin, by which a laborer could prepare for market three hundred pounds *per diem*. The combined genius of Hargraves, Arkwright, and Crompton, in Old England, had just produced the improved spinning-jenny, making one operator, who had hitherto toiled with wheel and distaff, master of twenty-two hundred rapid spindles. Cotton at once became, in Southern parlance, "king," and this New England invention rendered it the most lucrative production of the Southern States, the volume of annual business in this single article rising in half a century to *two hundred millions of dollars*. The Southern intellect early conceived that a system of perpetual, menial, unrequited servitude, based on *color inferiority*, was indispensable to the prosperity of that portion of the Union, and to the culture and development of the white classes. The representatives of free labor in the North and those of slave labor in the South soon towered into stalwart political organizations, vigilant and sensitive. To keep up the equilibrium between these diverse interests in the general Government became the study of statesmen, and, when possible, States representing the two interests were admitted into the Union simultaneously, and when this could not be done some compensating legislation, called a "compromise," was frequently sought. In 1820 the United States Senate was so evenly balanced between these interests that it became an absorbing question whether Missouri should reinforce the one or the other. The South prevailed, forcing upon the North a "compromise" providing that slavery should never be permitted north of the parallel of 36° 30′. As the territory lying north of that line comprised most of the nation's unoccupied domain, the theater of future States, it was soon discovered that that "compromise" had doomed the supremacy of the slave power. To save itself, the slave interest secured the annexation of Texas, a Mexican district, largely settled by planters from the cotton-growing States. The war with Mexico which followed ended with a large in-

crease of Free territory, which the South sought to grasp for slavery. The passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the obsequious favor of the Supreme Court, failed to satisfy the South, or to perpetuate its supremacy in the national Congress. In the election of Abraham Lincoln, in 1860, it lost the Federal control it had held uninterruptedly for more than forty years, and immediately plunged into disunion.

The oft-repeated threat of South Carolina to secede from the Union was carried out, and her unfortunate example was followed by many of her sister States. Then came a four years' devastating civil war, in which two millions six hundred and seventy-five thousand troops were marshaled by the North alone, more than six hundred battles fought, half a million of lives sacrificed, and six thousand millions of treasure expended. The unsuccessful South suffered losses nearly as great, leaving it utterly bankrupt and prostrate. The North emerged from this prolonged encounter with little show of exhaustion. The tables of the Provost Marshal General showed that, in addition to the more than a million armed warriors in the field at the close of the strife, there remained at home in the loyal States, subject to military duty, 2,254,063 men, from whom large armies could still have been drawn. Their commercial and productive interests also remained unimpaired. During the few years that have elapsed since the close of the struggle, the Government, drawing most of its revenue from the North, has canceled vast floating and miscellaneous claims, contributed to internal improvements, paid regularly its pensions and governmental expenses, met its gold interest, and reduced its funded indebtedness to nearly two thousand millions. With peace and good government, the national debt will no longer be felt as a burden, two thirds of the war expenditures having been already paid.

This gigantic civil war in a nation of enlightened freemen in the middle of the nineteenth century presents one of the most melancholy chapters in all history. Besides the dissipation and brutality of the period, like all great wars, it has cultivated a love of treachery, vandalism, and blood, from which this generation will scarcely recover. Still, it has not been without its political advantages. The great inquiry, Are

we a nation? it has *affirmatively settled.* May we not believe that the illusion that the Union is a group of "sovereign" States, loosely united, as by a rope of sand, and which may be parted at any time by the caprice of one to the ruin of all, has given place to the conviction that the *Union is a compact nation,* consisting indeed of States with local and domestic authority, but with a Federal Government supreme over them all, and charged with every thing distinctively national, and that this Union is in its plan *indissoluble?* If this has been settled, the war has not been in vain. Another advantage of the war is the rooting up of the iniquitous system of American slavery, the foulest blot on our national fame, to the perpetuation of which a powerful class had become so wedded that no smaller convulsion could have destroyed it.

It has thus taken a century to find the subordinate position of the individual States, and to define and develop the powers of the Federal Government. May its maturity be more peaceful and illustrious than its youth! The Union began with 815,615 square miles of territory, but by the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Alaska, it has grown to 3,678,392 square miles, an increase since the adoption of the Constitution of more than threefold. Its population of three millions has increased to forty-five millions, (with space for five times that number,) and its accumulated wealth has advanced in still greater proportion. About half the railroad track of the world is in the United States. The nation has grown up quickly to stalwart proportions, and is contributing its quota to the triumph of man in the world. American manufactures compete at last with those of the old nations. Our steam-engines, sewing machines, and musical instruments are in demand every-where. The great newspapers of England are printed on American presses. The watch-makers of Geneva and the diamond cutters of Amsterdam are startled by the genius of American artisans. Gold and silver have lost their former values, because of the productions of American mines. America could thrive though separated from the nations, but her neighbors need her surplus. The operatives of Europe are hungering for her cereals, and her pork, beef, butter and fruits are being exported in considerable quantities. Even

her petroleum, that drips through her coal beds, is exported to all civilized countries, and is found in the lantern of the wild Arab of the desert. American colleges, libraries, and art collections are taking high rank, and the discoveries of her astronomers and naturalists are quoted by the *savants* of Europe.

But this paper would be entirely incomplete if it did not glance at a few of the disturbing elements still rife in American politics, and which threaten danger to the republic. Despite the criticisms and evil predictions of its foes, the nation has passed proudly through its first century and commenced the second. The patriot, after reviewing the past, finds himself instinctively peering into the uncertain haze of the future, as if prompted to exclaim, "Watchman, what of the night?" or what of the second century of American history?

It cannot be denied that the enormous use of intoxicating drinks in the United States is a source of great disaster and danger to the republic. The liquor interest is the bane and sorrow of the community every-where. It is a large and unscrupulous factor in the politics of every considerable town in the land, which all good men are perpetually forced to resist. The waste of the nation from this evil is not easily calculated. It has recently been ascertained that the State of Pennsylvania spends eight millions per annum on schools, and eighty millions on intoxicating drinks. New York City has 489 churches, or one to every 2,045 of the population, costing annually about five millions; but it has 8,000 drinking dens, or one to every 125 of the population, on which it expends sixty millions. The city government receives annually about $300,000 from the Excise Bureau, but it expends a million in charities and corrections, and six millions on its police and its courts, while the citizens, through private charities, disburse four millions more; and eight tenths of all this is legitimately chargeable to drink. About seventy thousand churches are found in the United States, but the temples of Bacchus number fully a quarter of a million. While there are less than eighty-five thousand clergymen teaching righteousness, there are at least half a million of men dealing out *liquid damnation*. The amount consumed annually in strong drink is more than double the entire provision bill of the nation, and, according to the sworn testimony of the liquor dealers, equals fifteen hundred

millions of dollars, with other entailed expenditures and losses which are very great. The spectacle of a hundred and forty-three thousand persons annually licensed by Government to deal out weakness and woe in an enlightened Christian nation, wasting in one year sufficient to cancel our entire national debt, besides the pauperism, ignorance, and crime it involves, is an enormity too appalling to be long perpetuated in this age of reform. Moral suasion, during the last half century, has wrought wonders, causing the greatness of this evil to be every-where recognized, and legal suasion cannot long be delayed. It is certain to be a troublesome element in our political caldron during the next quarter of a century. The Government of the United States cannot be perpetuated by untaught paupers, dram dealers, or criminals; and the wise dealings of the sober classes cannot too soon be turned to the proper handling of this grave subject.

The *encroachments of Romanism* comprise another factor that has long disturbed the sea of American politics, and is likely to produce even greater agitation in the future. No finer examples of Christian fraternity ever appeared on the globe than are now found among Protestant denominations in the United States. They are all vigorous, and devoted to the best interests of the nation and the race. But Romanism is essentially out of harmony with all our notions of civil liberty, free schools, free thought, and freedom of religious worship. Its mission here is not to enjoy and perpetuate our freedom, but to subvert it. For more than one hundred years North America has been regarded as the nursery of those liberal ideas that have extended through many countries, and shaken in pieces so hopelessly much of the despotism of Europe. To gain the moral control of the United States has, therefore, been one of the leading schemes of the Papacy. In 1828 the *St. Leopold Foundation* was organized in Vienna, in Austria, under royal patronage, and with a grant of papal indulgence, for the purpose of promoting "the greater activity of Catholic missions in the United States." Another powerful organization for the *Propagation of the Faith* was established many years ago at Lyons in France. As early as 1832 this society began to send money to the bishops of this country, and since that time it has furnished them millions. This society claimed

that by the discoveries and the early settlements of the French and the Spanish all America was essentially Roman Catholic territory, and, though occupied by the Puritans and their posterity, that the Catholic Church could never abandon the invaded territory. To complete this general scheme the English Romanists formed an *Emigration Society*, to establish colonies of Romanists, under the guidance of their priests, in various parts of the United States. The early conquest of this country by Catholicism has long been predicted by both foreign and American Romanists. O. A. Brownson, an American papist, said many years ago: "A new day is dawning on this chosen land; a new chapter is about to open in our history, and the Church to assume her rightful position and influence. Our hills and valleys shall yet echo to the convent bell. No matter who writes, who declaims, who intrigues, who is alarmed, or what leagues are formed, *this is to be a Catholic country*, and from Maine to Georgia, from the broad Atlantic to the broader Pacific, the sacrifice is to be offered daily for the quick and the dead." Other and later predictions might be given. These united agencies, coupled with the superior advantages of the American soil, have brought millions of Romish subjects to these shores, and millions of money to establish the institutions and fasten on us the despotism of the Papacy. Jesuits were long trained at Vienna expressly for American work, and with their recent banishment from some European countries they have come in large numbers to our land. They are closely watching all our ecclesiastical, educational, and legislative movements. Political organizations in support of this faith were rife in the days of Andrew Jackson, and date back to a much earlier period. There is not a gathering of importance in which the visage of one or more Jesuit is not seen. Through all their history they have had no platform, no schemes, no interest, but *Rome*. They are always in the market watching for the highest bidder, and they have invariably supported the vilest candidates. Thirty years ago the Archbishop of New York nominated openly one of his adherents for the Legislature, who on the day of his election was a criminal in the *Tombs*. Pope Pius IX. gave his benediction to the disunionists of 1861. The true American, let it be understood, has no pique against people of foreign birth. Indeed, many of our adopted citizens

take rank at once with the very best of the land. The Jews of America, coming as they do from all points of the compass, are devoted to their purposes of gain, and are entirely harmless. The French, the Italian, the Spanish, and the Japanese have made but slight impression on American manners. The Chinese are feared only on the Pacific coast. The Germans, as a whole, are a valuable class, industrious, frugal, and thrifty. Of the ten thousand paupers now begging through our streets, not one in a hundred is of Germanic origin. They have not been educated to our notions of the Sabbath, but they are patriotic, and cannot be called disorderly or riotous. Even the Papists among them are not bigoted. Like their fathers in the days of Melanchthon, they are ready to read, and are open to conviction. The Irish Catholic element is the most troublesome in the nation, and, if it were sufficiently numerous, would be dangerous. Its strongest foothold is in the State of New York, where it amounts to about one seventh of the population, and the city of New York contains over two hundred thousand persons born in Ireland. The politicians of New York city have for many years pursued a most execrable and suicidal policy. Many of them have been Romanists, and others, to secure the suffrage of these masses, have granted these Romish leaders every public advantage. Block after block of valuable real estate belonging to the city has been given to the Romish hierarchy, while millions of money, drawn from the tax-payers, have been paid for the support of their institutions, conferring upon the adherents of this system an unfair and an unwarrantable influence in municipal affairs. This treacherous policy still continues. The officials that have favored Rome have been invariably promoted. John T. Hoffman was city judge during the riot of 1863, and was promptly promoted to the mayoralty and to the gubernatorial chair. A. Oakey Hall was district attorney during the riot, and rose in due time to the mayoralty. John R. Brady and M'Cunn were then judges in the lower courts, but were each advanced to the Superior Court. There are sixty thousand persons in New York city unable to read or write, residents chiefly of the first, second, fourth, sixth, eleventh, seventeenth, and twentieth wards. These localities have been for years the political stronghold of Tammany Hall, furnishing the repeaters and "shoulder hitters" of the

city; and in November, 1876, with the aid of a few wards in Brooklyn, they swelled the majority for Mr. Tilden to about seventy thousand in these cities, thus neutralizing the voice of most of the intelligent business men and the yeomanry of the State. But the Irish Catholic vote *alone* can never be sufficiently large to be dangerous in America. The annual increase from immigration is vastly smaller than formerly, and if the entire population of Ireland should be imported into these States during the next five years, it would be absorbed without any great shock to our governmental machinery. They can only hope for some occasional local successes, but can gain no general ones while Americans are true to their high mission. The Catholic Directory for 1877 reports 5,292 churches, 5,297 priests, and estimates the Roman Catholic population of the country to be 6,200,000. Their tables of adherents are usually greatly overestimated; but if correct in this instance, they number less than one seventh of the population, and claim no more than adhere to some single denominations of Protestants. They are, however, vigilant and taciturn, compactly organized, advancing or retiring along the whole line at given signals—defiant or courteous, open or secret, on definite system—and deserve the closest watching by all lovers of true liberty. Though they will test the wisdom and strength of American statesmanship, and gain temporary local advantages, the march of free inquiry and of liberal ideas in the world, and the widespread turning away of their children of the third generation from their system, prove that it is DOOMED, and can never become supreme in the United States.

Another danger to American institutions lies in our national system of *universal suffrage*. The average American boasts that in this land every man may be an elector, and wield his full meed of power in the control of the country. Granting that superior advantages are thus afforded the enlightened and virtuous citizen, it cannot be denied that it is a perilous experiment to place the ballot in the hand of every male who attains his majority, and of every foreigner who applies for naturalization. In the earlier days of the Republic the franchise was in most of the States limited to sundry qualifications. In Maryland and South Carolina an elector must own fifty acres of land. In Mississippi, Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware,

and New York, he must pay taxes or perform military service. In some States men were disqualified by pauperism, in others by their faith, and in still others by their color. The march of party politics has at length swept away nearly all these restrictions. The naturalization of so many foreigners, chiefly in the interest of the Democrats, led their opponents in the Northern States to seek the removal of the property and color disqualifications from native-born citizens; and finally the ballot was given to the freedman to counterbalance that of the disloyal white in the South. The only serious popular movement of any magnitude to restrict the use of the ballot was that of the *Native American* party, (the "Know Nothings,") made about 1854; and, as I am not a politician, I am free to say that in a modified form its principles should have prevailed. A more perilous policy is scarcely conceivable than this wholesale enfranchisement of untried foreigners, many of whom have been the malcontents of other countries, and have fled from the armies, the banditti, or the prisons of those lands. Unworthy of our protection, we commit to them our most vital interests. Before they are able to read our laws or speak our language they are clothed with the high prerogatives of citizenship, and encouraged to cast the ballot which in this land contains all the potency of the scepter and the throne. The New York riot of 1863, and numerous other riots and political disturbances all over the country, the organizations of liquor dealers, and the war on our free schools, are some of the first bitter fruit of this mistaken policy. No one of these movements could have assumed such formidable aspects but for the enfranchisement of vicious foreigners, on whom these plotting leaders know they can rely.

The enfranchisement of the Southern Negro was another experiment of great hazard, though a more pardonable measure, as an ignorant loyal citizen may be of greater service to his nation than an educated rebel. Though unschooled and totally unused to the exercise of government, he is not specially vicious or dangerous. At the period of the emancipation of these Southern Negroes a magnificent opportunity was afforded the ruling party to move for the wise restriction of the ballot in the whole country. By withholding it from the untaught colored man a strong argument would have been made for its

withdrawal from all other ignorant citizens, in whatever section and of whatever blood. It was, however, urged that an exigency in the nation's history, such as had never demanded the enfranchisement of the foreign-born, made that of the Negro a necessity. The gift to him of power has brought its chapters of triumph and defeat. The sullen indifference of the defeated whites has left him, in some instances, to misrule and ruin where their presence and counsels could easily have averted disaster. What is to be the destiny of the American Negro is one of the unknown problems of our times. The people who are speaking, writing, and legislating for him are careful not to get very near him, and most of his professed friends are chiefly anxious to secure his influence. One thing appears certain, he *will not dwindle* like the American savage. The death rate among people of color all over the country, it has recently been ascertained, greatly exceeds that of their white neighbors. But when we remember that most of our colored people have just emerged into freedom, with little knowledge of hygiene, medicine, and the abuses of liberty, this unusual mortality is not surprising. The colored man belongs to a fruitful progeny, so that, despite the wastes of war and the starving transitions through which he has passed, his race is more numerous in these States than in 1860. *He will not emigrate.* Long residence on this continent has made him as thoroughly American as any in the land, and he is not disposed to change countries. Whether he will finally concentrate in certain sections of the Union, pressing out the other races, or the color line gradually fade away by amalgamation, or whether the cultivated ebony shall rise up, the proud, permanent peer of every other race, (as the Irishman has done whom the English reckoned inferior two hundred years ago,) are questions we cannot now determine. The ballot has, however, been placed in his hand, and from his numerical strength he is destined henceforth to be a powerful factor in American history. Already the politician wants him, the Papist is setting his net, and the Protestant, though too tardily and inadequately, is seeking his cultivation. It is unfortunate both for him and for the nation that in his crude state unrestricted enfranchisement has been thrust upon him. It exposes him to the relentless cruelty of his proud political enemies, from whom the

Federal Government cannot defend him, and leaves him an unsuspecting prey to artful and unscrupulous leaders and teachers who are hastening for his capture. It also imperils the nation. I urge deliberately these three points against universal suffrage: 1. In the present uncultivated state of general society it grants ignorance an unwarrantable control in the affairs of a country. The instincts and wishes of the unschooled may sometimes be right, (though they are often quite wrong,) still, a degree of culture is essential to enable them to discern wise methods of procedure, and to fit them for the exercise of the functions of government. Intelligent suffrage is indispensable to the security of a Republic, and no man should in this land be allowed to wield a ballot he cannot read. 2. It elevates to office moderate men, and too frequently the vilest men. A comparison of the two houses of our national Congress will well illustrate this point. The House of Representatives chosen by universal suffrage has been largely filled for a quarter of a century with third-rate village lawyers, while the Senate chamber, whose members are chosen by selected bodies, has been thronged with the most cultured and able men of the nation. Men in New York city have been repeatedly elected to Congress and to the Judiciary whom no executive would dare to appoint and whom no Legislature would choose. 3. My final objection is, that it places the wealth of the country at the mercy of the poor, who are always in the majority. Common equity demands that capital should have (at least in some guarded sense) the control of taxation. The security, therefore, both of national and of individual interests in this Republic demands some greater restrictions of the franchise, and movements in that direction will, doubtless, occur before we advance far into this century. When they do occur, let all good citizens unite for its judicious enactment. We have swung from the aristocracy of the Old World and of the slave-holder to the opposite extreme, and must soon or late feel our way back to middle ground.

## Art. VI.—METHODIST STATISTICS.*

In the earliest period of Methodism it was a part of the *method* of its founder to write down for the information of all inquirers every fact of importance connected with the rise and progress of his Societies. "Minutes of Conversations" between Mr. Wesley and his ministers in their yearly Conferences were carefully printed, showing not only the doctrines and polity of the new movement which he supervised, and which was justly exciting public attention, but also noting its successes or failures in every department of its economy. This rigid system of statement in detail has given to Methodism a statistical history far superior in variety, extent and correctness to that of any other religious denomination.

That portion of the British Wesleyan Conference Minutes commencing with the Annual Conference of 1744, and closing with that of 1860, fills fourteen large octavo volumes, with an aggregate of 8,299 pages. The Minutes of the Annual Sessions of Conference since 1860 fill seventeen volumes 12mo., with a total of 6,800 additional pages. The last volume, that of 1877, contains 444 pages, many of them in small type, of which a considerable portion is made up of carefully tabulated statistics. This grand total of thirty-one volumes includes the returns for one hundred and thirty-four years.

The General Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church thus far issued cover the period from 1773 to 1877 inclusive. These Minutes make sixteen volumes, aggregating 9,923 pages. The gradual and ever increasing extension of the records of the annual returns marks the constant growth of the Church in all departments of her work. Beginning with a Conference when the whole of American Methodism embraced only ten preachers, and five pastoral charges, with 1,160 lay members, the first Minutes were circumscribed in scope, and were correspondingly brief in extent. The whole records for the first fifty-six years, covering the period from 1773 to 1828, inclusive, are included in the first volume, of

* The "Methodist Almanac" for 1878, British Wesleyan Conference Minutes, Minutes of Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of branches of the Methodist family, for 1877.

574 pages. The second volume includes the Minutes of eleven years; the third, seven years; the fourth, six years; the fifth, four years. Beginning with the sixth volume, and with the year 1856, each volume is filled with the records of only two years, and recently, in order to include two yearly records within the proper compass of a single volume, the type has been largely reduced in size. The last volume (for 1876 and and 1877) contains 804 super-royal octavo pages, and of these 192 are filled with tabulated figures closely arranged, and in type so small that a single page contains three times as much matter as a page of the "Quarterly Review."

In addition to these volumes of "Minutes" are the Journals of the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church. These fill eight octavo volumes, and furnish, in their reports and other records, a vast amount of connectional statistical information not contained in the Minutes of the Annual Conferences. To all these must be added the printed reports of the Missionary Society, the Sunday-School Union, the Tract Society, the Board of Church Extension, and the Freedmen's Aid Society, embracing in the several departments a total of many volumes of statistical facts. Other branches of Methodism, inheriting the usage from the parent Church, are also characterized severally by an ample statistical history. As already indicated, no denomination outside of the Methodist family furnishes statistical information approaching this, either in the scope of the topics, or in the regularity, extent, and fullness of the current statistical returns.

In correctness, as well as in scope and fullness, our statistics are also far in advance of those of other denominations in this country. While being far from perfect, (so that there is a desire in all directions among us for improvement,) they are so incomparably more reliable than those of other leading Churches, as to have secured the highest praise from the best statisticians of the age. Mr. Francis A. Walker, Superintendent of the last United States Census, in his official report of the same to the Secretary of the Interior, (and by the latter communicated to Congress, and by that body ordered published,*) says:—

Some of the larger religious denominations, either in consequence of their peculiar organization, or by reason of special

* See "Ninth Census of the United States," 1870.

efforts, maintain a careful system of reports and returns, and the statistics of such denominations are accordingly entitled to great consideration.

Foremost among these is the Methodist Church, which, by reason of its episcopal form of government and its scheme of changing periodically the pastors of Churches, is always in possession, as nearly as it would be possible to effect, of the true condition of its organization in all parts of the country to a late date. Dead Churches are not allowed to encumber its rolls, and consequently the lists of its several branches present their exact strength "for duty." This denomination, therefore, affords a high test of the accuracy of the returns of the Census; and, notwithstanding that it presents as much difficulty in enumeration as any other, the general correspondence between the statements embodied in the Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the principal branches of the Church, after making allowance for the known strength of certain minor branches which do not publish official returns, and the statistics of the denomination as given in the Census, is, taking all the States of the Union together, very decided. The slight differences that exist are sufficiently explained by differences between the dates of the returns and by the different rules of construction and classification which would naturally be adopted in doubtful cases by parties acting independently of each other.

There are other denominations, one or two, notably the Baptists, of great importance, in which an absence of central control in the government of the Churches and the want of a thorough system of reports and returns, deprive Church statistics of value. It is in respect of these, as a whole, that the discrepancies between the claims of the denomination and the results of the Census are greatest. In all such cases full and searching inquiry has been made; the recognized authorities of the Churches interested have been consulted, and assistant marshals have been called on to explain the discrepancy, and to review their own statements. Hundreds of letters have been written from the Census Office on the subject; thousands of Churches have been inquired for; and where differences, after all has been done, still exist, it only remains to be said that if this or that denomination has as many churches as it claims, the agents of the Census have not been able to find them.

Mr. Walker's official report, after furnishing this high testimony to the correctness of our Methodist statistics, proceeds to show remarkable discrepancies between the Census returns and those made by several of the other denominations. The Baptists, he says, report for the year 1870 a total of 17,535 churches, while the Census gives them only 14,084, a difference of 3,061. Another denomination claims 3,121 churches; the Census allows only 2,887; and another claims 3,753, while the Census allows only 1,445! In unanswerable argument

Mr. Walker proceeds to show that in each of the cases the disparity arises chiefly, if not wholly, from the incorrectness of the returns made by the Church compilers.

My own inquiries, made with as much thoroughness as possible, assure me of the general correctness of Mr. Walker's conclusions on the subject referred to. I have now before me two *Almanacs* of the Protestant Episcopal Church for 1878. Both seem to be the work of competent compilers, and each, in the absence of the other, being issued by a well-known and respectable publishing house of that denomination, would be regarded as officially correct. And yet in the reports of members, as given in the *Almanacs*, there is a discrepancy of over twenty thousand. Which is correct? The troubled inquirer is left to conjecture. The annual register of another denomination, issued since January 1, 1878, and giving the latest statistical summaries, contains two widely different "official statements" concerning members, the discrepancy being nearly 30,000. The statistician in search of correct figures is confounded by such a showing, and retires from the investigation in despair.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church every pastor is required to report each year to the conference secretaries, over his own signature, the statistics of his charge, revised to date; and in case of his decease or absence the Presiding Elder is held responsible for such reports. The reports are immediately collected in duplicate, one of the copies being forwarded by the Presiding Bishop to New York for insertion in the "General Minutes," and the other printed in the local conference minutes, for home circulation. This method of reporting and publishing each year, supplementing the system in each pastoral charge of keeping the register of members by classes, and of revising the lists yearly, (and in many charges, quarterly, and even monthly,) secures a very remarkable degree of accuracy in the annual returns of the Church. While there are occasional and even unpardonable mistakes in the reports of the pastors, and in some instances in those of the conference secretaries, (made chiefly in transcribing them,) they are much less frequent than some of our preachers have supposed. Indeed, the more careful and extensive the examination by any competent statistician, the more assuring will be the conclu-

sion that our statistics are comparatively a marvel of general accuracy and excellence.

The statistical summaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church for 1877, officially reported in the *Almanac* for 1878, and those in the "*General Minutes*," (though both series of tables were prepared by the same hand,) vary in some of the items, the difference arising from the fact that the former went to press before the holding of three or four of the South-western Conferences, while the latter was not issued until the complete official returns for the year had been received. In the subjoined tables the latest figures are given, and in each case compared with those closing the two previous decades:

ANNUAL CONFERENCES.—The number at close of 1877 was ninty-one; in 1867, sixty-eight; and in 1857, forty-seven. The gain during the former decade was twenty-one; during the latter twenty-three—a gain during two decades of forty-four Annual Conferences, or 93 6-10 per cent. In 1857 there were only two foreign Conferences, namely: Germany and Liberia; in 1877 the foreign Conferences were Germany, Liberia, Norway, Sweden, North India, and South India. Since the commencement of 1878, (and up to this writing, March 12,) two additional Conferences have been organized, namely: Little Rock, (colored,) by Bishop Harris, January 17; and Foochow, (Chinese,) by Bishop Wiley, January 20. The present number of Annual Conferences is, therefore, ninety-three.

BISHOPS.—The present number is eleven; in 1857 it was seven, and in 1867, ten. Thus far, covering the whole history of American Methodism, (111 years to Oct., 1877,) there have been in the Methodist Episcopal Church thirty-one Bishops, of whom twenty have passed from labor to reward. The first Bishops, Coke and Asbury, were elected in 1784, at which time the number of itinerant preachers was 83, and the lay-members, 14,986. The Episcopal ratio, omitting fractions, was one Bishop to 41 preachers, and to 7,493 lay-members. In 1787 the ratio was one Bishop to 66 preachers and to 12,921 members; in 1797, one Bishop to 131 preachers and to 29,331 members; in 1807, one Bishop to 258 preachers and to 72,295 members; in 1817, one Bishop to 238 preachers and to 74,951 members; in 1827, one Bishop to 325 preachers and to 127,332 members; in 1837, one Bishop to 449 preachers and to 94,081 members;

in 1847, one Bishop to 728 preachers and 127,294 members; in 1857, one Bishop to 876 preachers and 117,217 members; in 1867, one Bishop to 800 preachers and 114,608 members; and in 1877, one Bishop to 1,024 preachers and 151,964 members. In each case in these calculations the members on probation are properly counted with those in full connection.

ITINERANT PREACHERS.—The number of Itinerant Preachers returned in the Minutes of 1877 was 11,269, a gain during the year of 197. Of these 10,204 were in full connection, and 1,065 "on trial." The number of preachers received on trial in 1877 was 461; admitted into full connection, 401; located, 137; returned withdrawn, 40; expelled, 16; died, 118. The last four items give a total of 311, and show the loss to the itinerancy for the year.

The number received by transfer was 157; by re-admission, 20; and on credentials from other religious denominations, 18. Of those included in the last item there were received from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 3; Methodist Protestant Church, 3; African Methodist Episcopal Church, 3; African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, 2; Methodist Church of Canada, 2; Primitive Methodist Church in Canada, 1; United Methodist Free Church, 1; American Wesleyan, 1; Reformed Episcopal, 1; and Baptist, 1. The total number of accessions to the itinerancy during the year, on trial, by re-admission, and from other denominations, was 508. Deducting from this gain the loss, 311, we have 197, the net gain of preachers referred to above.

The following table, carefully compiled from the many volumes of Annual Minutes, shows the totals in the items named (so far as reported) from the organization of the Church until the close of 1877:—

| ITINERANT PREACHERS. | To and including 1857. | For Decade ending 1867. | For Decade ending 1877. | Grand Total. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Received on trial | 15,146 | 4,695 | 6,438 | 26,279 |
| Admitted into full connection | 10,606 | 3,256 | 4,962 | 18,824 |
| Located | 4,201 | 1,039 | 1,002 | 6,242 |
| Withdrawn | 222 | 257 | 244 | 723 |
| Expelled | 87 | 86 | 118 | 381 |
| Died | 1,277 | 736 | 1,079 | 3,092 |

A comparison of the first two items shows an apparent loss of 7,455 ministerial "probationers." In accounting for

this falling out, it should be noted: 1. That of this number 1,065 were still "on trial," their term of two years' probation not having expired, or having been extended. 2. That during the 104 years covered by these summaries a very large number fell out of the itinerant ranks by personal or family sickness or some other disability, or by death, during their two or more years of probationary service. 3. That in the earlier years of our Church history a very large number of persons entered the itinerancy as a *temporary arrangement*, in order to aid our meeting at once the imperative demand for preachers in the rapidly developing work. 4. That the severities of the itinerancy were then incomparably greater than now, in respect of fatiguing journeys, long absences from families, inadequate salaries, lack of privileges of education and of preparation for the full itinerant ministry. 5. That in retiring from the *itinerant* ranks, either before or at the close of their probation, the preachers did not retire from the Church, nor from her cherished ministry; they only re-entered another and honored, as well as useful, department of the Gospel service. 6. That of the number (6,242) who located *after their admission into "full connection,"* a large proportion did so within a comparatively brief period from the date of their admission. The same "causes" would be more powerfully operative before admission as full itinerants than afterward.

MINISTERIAL SERVICE.—The official ministerial appointments of the 11,269 preachers, returned in the Minutes of 1877, are indicated in the following table. As suggestive of the range of figures in the several departments of service, those for 1877 are collated with those of 1871 and 1867:—

| OFFICIAL APPOINTMENTS. | 1877. | 1871. | 1867. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Presiding Elders of Districts | 429 | 419 | 337 |
| Presiding Elders who are also Stationed Pastors | 26 | 7 | 21 |
| Presiding Elders with other Appointments | 3 | .. | .. |
| Agents of Book Concerns and Depositories | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Presidents and Principals of Educational Institutions | 94 | 88 | 95 |
| Professors of Colleges and Seminaries | 99 | 59 | 72 |
| Superintendents of other Institutions | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Chaplains by appointment of U. S. Government | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| Other Chaplains | 25 | 23 | 21 |
| Missionary and other Church Secretaries | 18 | 16 | 9 |
| Editors by episcopal appointment | 24 | 20 | 17 |

| Official Appointments. | 1877. | 1871. | 1867. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agents of Educational Institutions | 21 | 24 | 22 |
| Secretaries and Agents of Bible Societies | 18 | 27 | 24 |
| Secretaries and Agents of Temperance Societies | 11 | 8 | 8 |
| Other Agents | 27 | 20 | 11 |
| Conference and City Missionaries and Evangelists | 8 | .. | 3 |
| Itinerants appointed to Foreign Missions | 71 | .. | 17 |
| Supernumeraries | 719 | 548 | 461 |
| Superannuated | 1,193 | 971 | 854 |
| Itinerant Stationed Pastors | 9,440 | 7,452 | 6,036 |

In addition to the itinerant stationed pastors named in the last item above, there were 1,335 preachers (chiefly local preachers) appointed by Presiding Elders and Bishops to pastoral charges left at the Conference sessions "to be supplied."

Local Preachers.—The annual returns in the General Minutes do not give the number of Local Preachers until after the General Conference of 1836. The returns for 1837 show a total of 4,954. In 1844, the year of the separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the number had increased to 8,087. It is estimated that nearly 4,000 local preachers went with that Church. In 1847 the number reported in our Church was 4,913; in 1857 there were 7,169, a net increase for the decade of 2,256; in 1867 there were 9,469, an increase of 2,300; and in 1877 there were 12,537, an increase of 3,068; making a total net increase for the last thirty years of 7,624, or over *one hundred and fifty-five per cent.*

Since 1773 local preachers have contributed to the lists of itinerant ministers "received on trial" about 26,279 names. The number returned to the local ranks from the "full connection" department of the itinerancy is 6,217; the number returned from the list of itinerant probationers and the number "re-admitted" into full connection, the number who have died, and the losses from other causes, have not been recorded. In 1877, 1,335 pastoral charges were left "to be supplied;" and a large proportion of them were supplied by local preachers appointed by the Presiding Elders. A similar record would be true of other years.

Lay Members.—The total number of lay members reported in 1877 was 1,671,608, of whom 1,471,777 were members in full connection, and 199,831 were members on probation. The losses by death during the year aggregated 19,816. The

losses from other causes (by certificates of membership *in transitu*, withdrawals, suspensions, expulsions, etc.) are not recorded in the General Minutes. The total net gain of full members during the year was 46,783; decrease of members on probation, (chiefly by reception into full connection,) 26,687; net increase in lay membership for the year, 20,096.

Eleven decades and one year have passed since the organization of the first Methodist Society in this country. Counting in the first year, when the membership was very small, with the first subsequent decade, and taking the lay membership at intervals of ten years, we have the following table:—

| Years. | Lay Members. | Gain during Decade. | Years. | Lay Members. | Gain during Decade. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1777..... | 6,968 | ..... | 1837..... | 658,574 | 276,577 |
| 1787..... | 25,842 | 18,874 | 1847..... | 636,471 | *dec.* 22,103 |
| 1797..... | 58,863 | 33,021 | 1857..... | 820,519 | 184,048 |
| 1807..... | 144,590 | 85,727 | 1867..... | 1,146,081 | 325,562 |
| 1817..... | 224,853 | 80,263 | 1877 ..... | 1,671,608 | 525,527 |
| 1827..... | 381,997 | 157,144 | | | |

These figures speak eloquently and conclusively in answer to the question whether Methodism is losing its power as an aggressive force among the masses of the people. Here is a *net gain in members* (embracing good and true Christian men and women from all departments of society) *of over half a million during the last decade of our history!*

Losses by Death.—The utterance of Wesley, "*Our people die well*," has passed into a familiar proverb in Methodist homes in every part of the world. The *method* of preserving memoirs of deceased preachers was early adopted in England and America, and has given invaluable contributions to our Church history as well as our Church life. It is peculiar to Methodism.

Our General Minutes for 1877 include memoirs of 97 of the 118 preachers whose deaths are reported in that year. The British Wesleyan Minutes furnish memoirs of 42 of the 43 ministers deceased during the year, and state in a note that the remaining memoir, not having been received in time for present insertion, will be printed in the volume for 1878. In respect of length, the memoirs in our Minutes for 1877 average about 555 words each, and those in the British Conference Minutes average about 521 words each.

No deaths of preachers were reported in our General Minutes

until 1784, a period of eleven years. For the next forty years the number per year ranged from one to ten, the yearly average being only four; from 1824 to 1857, a period of thirty-two years, the average was 33, with a total of 1,053. Beginning with the year 1857, when the deaths of lay members were first officially reported, we have the following record:—

| Year. | Deaths of Preachers. | Deaths of Members. | Year. | Deaths of Preachers. | Deaths of Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1857..... | 46 | 8,462 | 1868..... | 84 | 12,772 |
| 1858..... | 52 | 9,214 | 1869..... | 82 | 13,554 |
| 1859..... | 53 | 9,845 | 1870..... | 92 | 14,244 |
| 1860..... | 66 | 9.835 | 1871..... | 84 | 15,682 |
| 1861..... | 64 | 10,375 | 1872..... | 101 | 17,048 |
| 1862..... | 73 | 10,662 | 1873..... | 136 | 18,900 |
| 1863..... | 91 | 13,269 | 1874..... | 104 | 18,105 |
| 1864..... | 88 | 13,448 | 1875..... | 135 | 19,591 |
| 1865..... | 86 | 13,116 | 1876..... | 143 | 19,010 |
| 1866..... | 80 | 12,214 | 1877..... | 118 | 19,816 |
| 1867..... | 83 | 12,575 | Total for 21 years. | 1,861 | 291,737 |

As stated on a previous page of this article, the total number of deaths of preachers up to the close of 1877 was 3,092. In order to approximate the number of deaths in the lay membership previous to 1857, a calculation may be made for each previous period of twenty-one years back to 1793, *based* upon the ratio of the yearly average of *members* to the yearly average of *deaths*, during the last period of twenty-one years. For the remaining double decade from 1773 (the first Conference) a small allowance must also be added. Combining the several numerical items thus obtained with the total of the official summaries in the table above, we have a grand total of 605,504.

The ratio of increase in the ministerial death list for the last period of twenty-one years is $156\frac{52}{100}$, and in that of lay members $134\frac{17}{100}$. At this rate the death list for the year 1898 will be 302 preachers and 46,403 lay members, and in the year 1900 a death list of 320 preachers, and about 49,000 lay members. These figures will indicate to the reader the large influx of new ministers and members required to meet the numerical waste from the single item of "deaths." Last year the average weekly mortality in the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was *three hundred and eighty-three*, and a daily average of about *fifty-five!*

Our Colored Work.—The Methodist Episcopal Church has from the beginning welcomed colored persons into its

membership. The first class in the old John-street Society had one colored member, and the historic fact is well attested that there has never been a time since when the membership of that Church did not include one or more colored persons. Other "white" Churches in the North have colored members, and some of the "colored" charges in the South have white members. In the spring of 1864 Philadelphia Conference reported, in a total membership of 59,498, colored members to the number of 6,894. Most of these were organized with others during the same year into the Delaware Conference.

In the South, and in the "Border States," the white and colored work has been, to a large extent, arranged into separate Conferences. Those Annual Conferences which are either wholly or chiefly "colored" are the following: Liberia, Delaware, Washington, North Carolina, South Carolina, Savannah, Florida, Central Alabama, Lexington, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, West Texas, and Little Rock.

By carefully collating the statistics of those Conferences exclusively colored, with the statistics of the colored Churches in the various mixed Conferences, we have the following summaries for 1877:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Itinerant Preachers..... | 928 | Total Baptisms for the year.. | 18,872 |
| Local Preachers..... | 1,976 | Church Edifices..... | 1,442 |
| Total Preachers..... | 2,904 | Value of Church Edifices... | $1,562,501 |
| Lay Members in Full Connection..... | 127,326 | Parsonages..... | 143 |
| Lay Members on Probation.. | 21,325 | Value of Parsonages..... | $77,675 |
| Total Lay Members..... | 148,651 | Total Val. Ch's and Parson's. | $1,640,176 |
| Deaths of Members for year | 2,674 | Sunday-schools..... | 1,731 |
| Baptisms of Children..... | 11,142 | S. S. Officers and Teachers.. | 8,513 |
| Baptisms of Adults..... | 7,730 | Sunday-school Scholars..... | 80,950 |
| | | Total Teachers and Scholars. | 89,463 |

GERMAN METHODISM.—The German work in the Methodist Episcopal Church began in Cincinnati in 1835, when Dr. William Nast collected together a half dozen Germans in a small hired house in that city. The class there formed was the "little one which became a thousand." At the session of the Ohio Conference, held at Springfield, Ohio, August 19, 1835, William Nast was received on trial, and appointed German missionary for Cincinnati. In 1838 he was appointed German editor of the "Christian Apologist." The first German Conference was organized in the autumn, and reported in the Minutes of that year 22 members. The first German

Methodist Episcopal Church was built in Wheeling, West Va., in 1840. In 1844 the work was separated into German Districts, and in 1864 the first German Conference was formed. The mission work in Germany opened in Bremen under the late Dr. L. S. Jacoby, December 23, 1849. The English Wesleyan Methodists had previously entered upon mission work in Southern Germany. Our German work in Europe was organized into a Mission Conference in 1856, with a membership of 9 itinerant preachers, 7 local preachers, and 527 lay members.

The present strength of the Methodist Episcopal German work is indicated by the following summaries for 1877:—

| German Methodism. | 1867. | 1877. | Increase in Ten Years. | Gain per cent. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual Conferences | 5 | 7 | 2 | 40. |
| Traveling Preachers | 341 | 542 | 201 | 58.9 |
| Local Preachers | 327 | 465 | 138 | 42.2 |
| Total Preachers | 668 | 1,007 | 339 | 50.7 |
| Lay Members | 32,259 | 52,216 | 19,957 | 61.8 |
| Adult Baptisms | 44 | 62 | ..... | .... |
| Infant Baptisms | 3,441 | 4,240 | ..... | .... |
| Church Edifices | 441 | 667 | 226 | 51.2 |
| Value of Church Edifices | $1,214,466 | $3,679,860 | $2,465,394 | 203. |
| Parsonages | 175 | 316 | 141 | 80.5 |
| Value of Parsonages | $175,985 | $343,450 | $163,465 | 90.8 |
| Sunday-schools | 621 | 1,042 | 421 | 67.7 |
| Officers and Teachers | 5,148 | 8,771 | 3,623 | 70.3 |
| Sunday-school Scholars | 28,279 | 52,753 | 24,474 | 87.2 |

Our English Wesleyan brethren have one district in Germany, embracing (in March, 1877) 21 German pastoral charges, with a total of 22 traveling preachers and 2,356 lay members.

Our Work in the South.—The following gives the totals, in the items named, for the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1877:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Annual Conferences | 22 | Church Edifices | 2,423 |
| Itinerant Preachers | 1,323 | Value of Church Edifices | $1,486,606 |
| Local Preachers | 2,814 | Parsonages | 232 |
| Total Preachers | 4,136 | Value of Parsonages | $157,440 |
| Total Lay Members | 226,167 | Tot. Val. Ch's and Parsonages | $1,644,046 |
| Deaths of Memb's during year | 2,906 | Sunday-schools | 2,664 |
| Baptisms of Children | 10,816 | S. S. Officers and Teachers | 14,624 |
| Baptisms of Adults | 12,131 | Sunday-school Scholars | 124,925 |
| Total Baptisms for the year | 22,947 | Total Teachers and Scholars | 139,549 |

In the compilation of the above table the summaries of the following Conferences are embraced: North Carolina,

South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Savannah, Alabama, Central Alabama, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Lexington, Holston, Tennessee, Central Tennessee, Mississippi, Little Rock, Arkansas, Louisiana, Southern German, Austin, Texas, and West Texas. One of these (Little Rock) was organized since the commencement of 1878. Delaware, Washington, Baltimore, South Kansas, St. Louis, Missouri, Southern California, and South-west German are counted with the North. Those who desire to class any of the latter with the South will only need to select the proper figures in the General Minutes, and combine them with those above.

GROWTH OF WHOLE LAY MEMBERSHIP COMPARED WITH THAT OF POPULATION.—Here, also, the figures show largely to the advantage of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Instituting a comparison by taking the decades corresponding with those of the U. S. Census reports, we have this interesting table:—

| YEARS. | Population. | Increase. | Gain per ct. in Population. | Gain per ct. in M. E. Ch. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1790..... | 3,929,827 | ..... | ... | .... |
| 1800..... | 5,305,937 | 1,376,110 | 35.02 | 12.60 |
| 1810..... | 7,239,814 | 1,933,887 | 36.45 | 168.96 |
| 1820..... | 9,638,191 | 2,398,377 | 33.12 | 48.87 |
| 1830..... | 12,866,020 | 3,227,829 | 33.49 | 83.21 |
| 1840..... | 17,069,453 | 4,203,433 | 32.67 | 68.38 |
| 1850..... | 23,191,876 | 6,122,423 | 35.87 | .... |
| 1860..... | 31,443,321 | 8,297,685 | 35.78 | 44.20 |
| 1870..... | 38,558,371 | 7,115,050 | 22.62 | 37.47 |

The figures showing the progress of the Church for the decade ending with 1850 are omitted, because, as previously noted, during that decade nearly half a million of members fell out of our count by the separation and organization of the Southern Church. It will be seen that the Methodist Episcopal Church has led the population in every decade from the beginning except one. Taking all the decades except the one in which the Southern separation was effected, the average increase in population for each decade was 32.73, while that of our Church Lay-membership has been 66.24, or *more than double that of the population!*

STRENGTH OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH BY STATES.—The space assigned to this paper will not permit a discussion of this question. As an indication, however, of a class of facts which would appear by carefully tabulated statistics in

many of the States, the reader is referred to the annexed table, compiled from the "Census of the State of New York for 1875," recently issued by the State authorities in Albany:—

| Denominations in State. | Organizat'ns | Edifices. | Sittings. | Membership. | Property. | | Annual Amo'nt Paid for Salaries of Clergy. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Ch'ch Edifices, with Lots. | Other Real Estate. | |
| Methodist Episcopal | 1,785 | 1,766 | 619,882 | 180,783 | $14,566,897 | $2,428,475 | $1,137,885 |
| African M. E. | 48 | 47 | 14,065 | 3,261 | 274,800 | 16,400 | 19,095 |
| African M. E. Zion | 5 | 5 | 2,075 | 111 | 20,700 | 500 | 2,100 |
| Calvinistic Methodist | 17 | 17 | 4,975 | 1,090 | 74,500 | 8,050 | 5,294 |
| Evangelical Association | 60 | 60 | 17,595 | 5,786 | 437,200 | 49,650 | 33,935 |
| Independent Methodist | 1 | 1 | 175 | 5 | 1,000 | 50 | 150 |
| Methodist Protestant | 15 | 15 | 3,581 | 884 | 28,300 | 3,245 | 5,005 |
| Primitive Methodist | 2 | 2 | 900 | 205 | 48,500 | 8,000 | 1,500 |
| Reformed Methodist | 5 | 5 | 1,250 | 217 | 7,800 | 1,700 | 1,300 |
| United Brethren in Christ | 4 | 4 | 870 | 130 | 4,400 | 1,500 | 750 |
| Free Methodist | 89 | 85 | 22,685 | 3,716 | 234,260 | 27,700 | 30,588 |
| Wesleyan Methodist | 52 | 52 | 13,175 | 2,713 | 148,800 | 15,850 | 17,464 |
| Total Methodist | 2,063 | 2,059 | 700,678 | 196,900 | $15,845,657 | $2,561,120 | $1,255,016 |
| Baptist | 823 | 812 | 313,653 | 100,386 | $3,871,800 | $648,375 | $690,291 |
| Freewill Baptist | 109 | 102 | 29,350 | 6,051 | 284,600 | 43,225 | 33,190 |
| Seventh-Day Baptist | 26 | 26 | 8,905 | 3,335 | 76,150 | 5,475 | 10,178 |
| Total Baptist | 958 | 940 | 351,908 | 109,972 | $8,732,550 | $697,075 | $678,759 |
| Presbyterian | 716 | 708 | 388,442 | 111,660 | $16,590,800 | $2,523,870 | $950,770 |
| United Presbyterian | 55 | 55 | 24,970 | 9,015 | 564,100 | 86,625 | 61,710 |
| Reformed Presbyterian | 23 | 23 | 9,250 | 3,023 | 356,700 | 9,075 | 28,650 |
| Total Presbyterian | 794 | 786 | 372,662 | 123,698 | $17,511,100 | $2,619,570 | $1,041,130 |
| Friends, Hicksite | 22 | 22 | 10,650 | 1,563 | 346,100 | 14,850 | ..... |
| Orthodox | 24 | 24 | 6,750 | 987 | 68,650 | 700 | ..... |
| Not specified | 45 | 44 | 11,705 | 2,394 | 221,200 | 14,900 | ..... |
| Total Friends | 91 | 90 | 29,105 | 4,964 | $635,950 | $30,450 | ..... |
| Protestant Episcopal | 561 | 552 | 296,092 | 78,515 | 21,616,750 | 2,984,620 | 810,672 |
| Congregational | 258 | 257 | 107,847 | 30,922 | 3,210,300 | 402,700 | 265,045 |
| Refo'ed (Dut.) Ch. in U.S. | 237 | 235 | 109,815 | 35,397 | 5,770,398 | 2,188,325 | 201,240 |
| Evangelical Lutheran | 201 | 200 | 77,781 | 34,439 | 2,010,000 | 458,860 | 186,658 |
| Union | 147 | 147 | 43,515 | 7,747 | 682,100 | 20,950 | 37,796 |
| Universalist | 115 | 113 | 41,978 | 9,651 | 1,413,400 | 33,300 | 96,299 |
| Christian Connection | 102 | 100 | 28,555 | 6,270 | 247,920 | 25,500 | 34,991 |
| Campbellites | 26 | 26 | 8,340 | 2,330 | 111,700 | 700 | 15,265 |
| Second Adventists | 14 | 13 | 2,992 | 609 | 28,150 | 3,425 | 3,250 |
| United Evangelical Ch'ch | 13 | 13 | 5,970 | 3,699 | 68,300 | 6,500 | 8,425 |
| Reformed Church in U.S. | 11 | 11 | 4,610 | 1,821 | 65,000 | 13,900 | 9,300 |
| Unitarian | 10 | 16 | 3,560 | 2,477 | 317,000 | ..... | 46,000 |
| Moravian | 10 | 10 | 2,515 | 668 | 163,400 | 20,350 | 5,300 |
| True Reformed Dutch Ch. | 7 | 7 | 2,120 | 244 | 73,500 | 2,000 | 3,900 |
| New Jerusalem Church | 7 | 6 | 1,575 | 206 | 158,300 | 5,000 | 8,100 |
| Shakers | 3 | 3 | 2,000 | 326 | 35,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Independent | 2 | 2 | 880 | ..... | 40,000 | ..... | 2,900 |
| Seventh-Day Adventists | 2 | 2 | 350 | 84 | 5,600 | 650 | ..... |
| Mennonites | 2 | 2 | 300 | 61 | 700 | ..... | ..... |
| Advent Chris. Association | 1 | 1 | 300 | 58 | 4,500 | ..... | 600 |
| Roman Catholic | 618 | 609 | 287,226 | * 518,714 | 13,301,590 | 4,366,490 | 467,814 |
| Jewish | 46 | 45 | 25,446 | 5,775 | 3,586,500 | 65,500 | 79,590 |
| Grand total in New York | 6,320 | 6,243 | 2,587,470 | 1,177,470 | $101,105,765 | $16,491,385 | $5,908,231 |

A glance at the preceding table will show that in the State of New York the Methodist Episcopal Church leads all the other denominations in all the items given in the Census except that of Church property.

* The Roman Catholic Church counts in its membership the whole *population*.

PROGRESS IN CHURCH PROPERTY AND SUNDAY-SCHOOL WORK.—The General Minutes do not furnish a yearly record of the number of Churches and parsonages, with their estimated value, and of the number of Sunday-schools, with their officers and teachers, until 1857. By collating the returns from and including that date, we have a table furnishing at once a most lucid, instructive, and gratifying exhibit of the progress of the Methodist Episcopal Church in these departments of Christian effort during the last two decades:—

| Year. | Churches. | Value. | Parsonages. | Value. | Sunday-schools. | Officers and Teachers. | Scholars. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1857 | 8,835 | $15,781,810 | 2,174 | $2,124,874 | 10,766 | 114,791 | 591,468 |
| 1858 | 9,063 | 17,560,494 | 2,407 | 2,350,999 | 11,490 | 129,368 | 677,217 |
| 1859 | 9,205 | 18,822,640 | 2,540 | 2,427,168 | 11,755 | 139 299 | 732,592 |
| 1860 | 9,754 | 19,554,054 | 2,674 | 2,563,318 | 13,243 | 146,180 | 793,181 |
| 1861 | 9,922 | 20,069,560 | 2,763 | 2,669,907 | 13,336 | 146,910 | 800,266 |
| 1862 | 9,860 | 20,605,981 | 2,792 | 2,681,790 | 13,193 | 146,979 | 805,050 |
| 1863 | 9,480 | 20,830,554 | 2,858 | 2,790,150 | 13,008 | 146,967 | 834,176 |
| 1864 | 10,015 | 24,781,510 | 2,948 | 3,101,566 | 13,158 | 148,475 | 859,700 |
| 1865 | 10,041 | 26,750,502 | 3,143 | 4,396,781 | 13,948 | 158,699 | 931,724 |
| 1866 | 10,462 | 29,594,004 | 3,314 | 4,420,958 | 14,045 | 162,191 | 980,622 |
| 1867 | 11,121 | 35,685,439 | 3,570 | 5,261,295 | 15,341 | 174,945 | 1,061,891 |
| 1868 | 11,692 | 41,693,922 | 3,810 | 6,276,579 | 15,885 | 181,666 | 1,145,167 |
| 1869 | 12,048 | 47,253,067 | 3,968 | 6,962,230 | 16,393 | 184,596 | 1,179,984 |
| 1870 | 13,378 | 52,614,591 | 4,179 | 7,293,513 | 16,912 | 189,412 | 1,221,898 |
| 1871 | 13,440 | 56,911,960 | 4,309 | 7,786,804 | 17,555 | 193,979 | 1,267,742 |
| 1872 | 14,008 | 62,898,287 | 4,484 | 8,575,877 | 17,471 | 193,691 | 1,275,569 |
| 1873 | 14,490 | 66,332,580 | 4 677 | 8,442,554 | 18,061 | 197,180 | 1,316,603 |
| 1874 | 15,010 | 69,2~8,815 | 4,893 | 9,604,230 | 18,628 | 200,402 | 1,368,876 |
| 1875 | 15,633 | 71,352,294 | 5,017 | 9,731,628 | 19,287 | 207,182 | 1,406,168 |
| 1876 | 15,816 | *71,760,771 | 5,215 | *9,508,900 | 19,691 | 208,966 | 1,451,088 |
| 1877 | 16,200 | 70,239,441 | 5,355 | 9,175,480 | 19,868 | 216,902 | 1,493,718 |
| Increase former dec. | 2,786 | 20,104,129 | 1,396 | 3,284,421 | 4,575 | 60,154 | 490,423 |
| " latter " | 5,079 | 34,354,002 | 1,785 | 3,814,185 | 4,594 | 41,957 | 411,897 |
| Total gain | 7,865 | 54,458,131 | 3,181 | 7,048,606 | 9,099 | 102,111 | 902,250 |

The above figures show a *net* gain during the last twenty years as follows: In number of church edifices, $94\frac{36}{100}$ *per cent.*; value of church edifices, $345\frac{7}{100}$ *per cent.*; parsonages, $146\frac{32}{100}$ *per cent.*; value of parsonages, $331\frac{49}{100}$ *per cent.*; Sunday-schools, $84\frac{98}{100}$ *per cent.*; Sunday-school officers and teachers, $89\frac{19}{100}$ *per cent.*; and in scholars, $153\frac{6}{100}$ *per cent.*

COMPARISON WITH OTHER CHURCHES.—The last United States Census, 1870, shows that in that year the relative strength of the six leading denominations was as follows:—

| Denominations. | Organizations, 1870. | Edifices, 1870. | Sittings, 1870. | Property, 1870. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Methodists | 27,538 | 22,915 | 7,455,937 | $73,975,581 |
| Baptists (all kinds) | 15,829 | 13,962 | 4,360,135 | 41,608,198 |
| Total Presbyterians | 7,824 | 7,071 | 2,698,244 | 53,265,256 |
| Congregational | 2,887 | 2,715 | 1,117,212 | 25,069,698 |
| Protestant Episcopal | 2,835 | 2,601 | 991,051 | 36,514,549 |
| Roman Catholic | 4,127 | 3,806 | 1,900,514 | 60,985,566 |

The Roman Catholics now claim in the United States about 5,000 bishops and priests, 7,000 churches, chapels, and stations,

* Decrease caused by lowering old estimates so as to conform to changed market.

and a total *population* of about 6,000,000; and this entire population is incorrectly counted in the membership!

The other large denominations, in their later numerical summaries, furnish the following figures:—

| | Ministers. | Members. | | Ministers. | Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baptists..... | 14,596 | 2,024,224 | Congregationalists. | 3,333 | 350,658 |
| Presbyterians.. | 6,631 | 670,224 | Protestant Epis. .. | 2,900 | 281,977 |

The figures which go to make up the Baptist total in this table are in many cases largely "estimated;" (see "Baptist Year Book for 1878;") but assuming them to be correct, we are confronted with the fact that in obtaining them the returns are taken of all "Baptist" congregations, *without respect of ecclesiastical or denominational affiliations.* Over half of the ministers and over two thirds of the Churches and members are in the South, and there is no connectional bond between them and those in the North. They are as widely separated in any denominational fellowship as are the Northern and Southern Presbyterians, or the different branches of the Methodist family.

In any fair comparison, therefore, with the "Baptists," *similar totals must be taken from the other denominations.* In the first of the following tables the Presbyterian total embraces those reported by the General Assemblies, North and South, and the "Methodist" totals those reported by the branches which are *episcopal* in their connectional administration. In the second, the latest official returns of *all* Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Protestant Episcopal denominations in the United States are properly grouped together.

| *First Table.* | Ministers. | Members. | *Second Table.* | Ministers. | Members. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Methodists ..... | 20,708 | 3,120,068 | Total Methodists. | 22,718 | 3,293,469 |
| Baptists, N. and S. | 14,596 | 2,024,224 | " Baptists .. | 16,384 | 2,147,411 |
| Presbyte's, N. & S. | 6,631 | 670,224 | " Presbyte'n | 7,908 | 857,858 |
| Congregat'nalists | 3,333 | 350,658 | " Congrega's | 3,333 | 350,658 |
| Protestant Epis.. | 3,216 | 281,977 | " Prot. Epis. | 3,216 | 281,977 |

[The grouping in this table includes the Baptists, ("Regular,") Anti-Mission Baptists, Free-Will Baptists, Seventh-Day Baptists, and Six-Principle Baptists; also the Presbyterian, Southern Presbyterian, Cumberland Presbyterian, Reformed Presbyterian, and United Presbyterian Churches. For a complete list of Methodist Churches, whose statistics are included, see Methodist Almanac for 1878, page 40. In the total of Methodist ministers the local preachers (26,443) are not included, although many of them are ordained, and have been engaged in pastoral work.]

The remarkable relative success of Methodism thus far in this and in other countries imposes upon her ministers and members corresponding obligations of continued loyalty to her "doctrines," "polity," and "usages." *His signis vincemus.*

## ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (Philadelphia.)—1. How Exclusive Ownership in Property First Originated: Communism. 2. Actual Situation of the Church in Countries Outside of European Sway. 3. The Metaphysics of Insanity: A Psychological Research. 4. The Aryan Language and Literature. 5. The Survival of Ireland. 6. The Bible in American History. 7. The Mercersburg Movement: An Attempt to Find Ground on which Protestantism and Catholicity might Unite.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1878. (Andover.)—1. Women Keeping Silence in Churches. 2. The Bearing of Recent Scientific Thought upon Theology. 3. Horae Samaritanae. 4. A Century of War and its Lesson. 5. Theories of Atonement. 6. The Star of the East.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January, 1878. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Allentown Church Case. 2. Relation of American Colleges to Christianity. 3. The Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church. 4. Prayer-Cures. 5. Use and Abuse of Denominationalism. 6. Interpretation of Philippians ii, 6, 7.

NEW-ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, January, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Biographical Sketch of William B. Towne, A.M., Founder of the "Towne Memorial Fund." 2. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Dartmouth. 3. Penhallow Papers. 4. Genealogy of the Penhallow Family. 5. Autobiography of William Rotch. 6. Prison Ships and Old Mill Prison, Plymouth, England. 7. Record of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, Inspection, and Safety. 8. Deaths in Stratham, N. H. 9. Will of Nowell Hilton, 1687. 10. Deed to Thomas Cammock from Gorges and Mason, 1684. 11. John Grenaway. 12. Letter of Paul Richard to Jacob Wendell. 13. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown, Mass. 14. Longmeadow, Mass., Families. 15. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison, 1777–79. Diary of Timothy Connor. 16. Papers relating to the Solart Estate, Wenham. 17. Voyages of Gosnold and Pring to New England, 1602–3. 18. Taxes under Governor Andros. 19. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Lyme, Conn.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, January, 1878. (Baltimore.)—1. Edwards on the Will. 2. Mrs. Browning. 3. The Papacy and the Civil Power of the Empire. 4. The Gospel according to St. John. 5. The Homeric Poems.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, January, 1878. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Theories of the Pentateuch. 2. The Bible, and its Influence upon Modern Literature and Art. 3. A Critic Reviewed. 4. Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.—No. XII.

NEW ENGLANDER, January, 1878. (New Haven.)—1. New-Fangled Congregationalism. 2. Aphorisms concerning the Inspiration of the Scriptures. 3. The Philosophy of the Unconscious in Court. 4. Review of President Seelye's Inaugural Address on the Relations of Learning and Religion, at Amherst College. 5. Professor Tyndall's Last Deliverance. 6. Review of Dr. Dale's Lectures on Preaching, recently delivered at Yale College. 7. Review of Rev. Newman Smyth's Work on the "Religious Feeling." 8. The Political Outlook. 9. Review of Principal Shairp's Work "On Poetical Interpretation of Nature." 10. Review of Rev. Joseph Cook's Lectures on Biology.

NEW ENGLANDER, March, 1878.—1. New England Secessionists. 2. Talk on Art. 3. The Doctrine of Future Punishment. 4. A Review of "Transcendentalism." 5. Victor Emanuel: the First King of Italy. 6. Schliemann's Explorations.

With the present volume this review changes from a Quarterly to a Bimonthly, in the hope of an earlier discussion of

topics of public interest. The freshly revived debate on the duration of future punishment furnishes the occasion of a triple article, consisting of three essays by prominent Congregational ministers. The first, by Professor Fisher, is an excellent "Sketch of the History of the Doctrine," showing that through the first six centuries of the Church, its patristic period, the prevalent opinion was that future punishment is endless, though Origen, Clement, and a few others thought otherwise. Then came the doctrine of Purgatory, with its notion of reforming and purifying of souls after death, founded on a suggestion of Augustine; and this was the common belief when the Reformers arose. The opinions of later German and English theologians receive appropriate mention, but the course of thought in this country is not traced. Professor Fisher makes the following important statement: "As a historical fact, belief in restoration and kindred doctrines is seen to spring up, in different quarters, in the wake of the mitigated form of theology to which we have referred," namely, "modified Calvinism."

The second and third essays, written independently of each other, and on the same subject, "The Teaching of Christ respecting the Duration of Future Punishment," are furnished by Rev. J. M. Whiton and Professor W. S. Tyler. They may be taken as representing the two phases of thought which seem to exist among our Congregational brethren. The former examines three questions, namely: "1. Did Christ teach that future punishment ends in purification and restoration? 2. Did he teach that it ends in extinction of being? 3. Did he teach that it is endless?" The conclusion reached by Mr. Whiton we give in his own words: "It does not appear that the teachings of Christ pronounce upon the duration of future punishment. They affirm no hope of restoration, they foretell no ultimate extinction, they enforce no belief in an endless consciousness of misery. So far as an unbiased criticism can arrive at the exact meaning of language, Christ's language is so indecisive as to the *duration* of future punishment, that any one of these three alternatives may be the real fact, although they may not seem equally probable."

Professor Tyler, whose scholarly eminence is everywhere acknowledged, enters upon a thorough examination of αἰών and

*αἰώνιος*, words that, as he observes, "have their root in the adverb *ἀεί* or *αἰεί*, which, both in etymology and in meaning, is the exact equivalent of the English *aye* and *ever*, of the German *ewig*, the Gothic *aivs*, the Latin *aevum*, etc.,—it is, in fact, the same *word* appearing under various forms, but with the same signification, in these and other branches of the Indo-European family of languages. It is in its essence a *time* word, and means not *any* time, but *every* time; not once or at some time, (that in Greek is *ποτέ*,) but all the time, or at all times, always, forever." The classical use of the words is shown by passages from Hesiod, Homer, Plato, Plutarch, Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, and other Greek writers, by whom they are employed whenever they desire to speak of *duration without end*. On their use in the Septuagint and the New Testament, we have the following:—

Whatever may have been the original or etymological signification of the word *olam*, there can be no doubt of its use in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the word usually employed by the sacred writers to express the longest duration of which they had any conception—duration without limit or end. And this word in its various forms is in all ordinary cases rendered by the Seventy into the Greek *αἰών* and its derivatives. Thus it is employed in the second verse of the Ninetieth Psalm to express in the strongest language the Psalmist's conception of the eternity of the divine existence: "Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God," in the Septuagint version, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*, in Gesenius' Lexicon *ab aeternitate ad aeternitatem*. This verse in its connection with the preceding verse shows that the Hebrew *olam* is not less, but more, definite in its meaning than the Greek *αἰών*. *Αἰών* in classic Greek sometimes means a life-time; *olam* always means at least a world-time, and in the Scriptures it means *eternity* more frequently than any thing else. In the conception of the Psalmist God's existence endures not only generation after generation through all the generations of men, *ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ*, Heb. *be-dor-va-dor*, but age after age through all the ages that preceded and will follow the creation of the world. So Psa. ciii, 17: the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*. Psa. cvi, 10, *et passim:* his mercy endureth forever, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. Exod. xv, 18: The Lord reigneth for ever and ever, *τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα*. Dan. iv, 3: His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, *αἰώνιος*; v. 34: whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, *αἰώνιος*. Psa. xxvi, 4: Trust ye in the Lord forever, *ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*; in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength, more literally, as in the margin, the

rock of ages, Sept. *αἰώνιος*. But it is needless to multiply examples. These will show not only a frequent, but the prevailing, usage in regard to these words in the Septuagint. They are for the most part employed to express the duration of the divine existence, of the attributes of God, of his government and kingdom, and of the worship, honor, praise, and glory that are due to his name, which are, of course, beyond all question everlasting, without end. And in other passages they mean everlasting in the popular sense in which we speak of the *everlasting mountains*, *everlasting* or, more frequently and less strongly, *endless* disputes—forms of expression which are common in all languages, and which do not change the proper signification of the *words* everlasting and endless, but limit their meaning in certain connections. *Forever*, *everlasting*, etc., are the proper and only proper renderings for them. The Hebrew *olam*, the Greek *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, and the English *forever* and *everlasting* are substantially equivalent; they are the strongest words these languages have to express the longest duration of which the people had any conception; they are the proper words to express the eternity of God and his attributes; and yet no one can misunderstand them when, in a popular and secondary sense, they are predicated of things of shorter duration.

Passing now to the New Testament we find, as we should expect, the same Greek words employed in much the same way as in the Septuagint. In the great majority of instances *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are used to express the duration of the happiness of the righteous, or of the existence of God, or Christ, and the glory due to his name. A little more detail and illustration will enable our readers to judge for themselves. Of the ninety-five instances in which the word *αἰών* occurs, leaving out disputed readings, in sixteen it is used in ascriptions of praise to God and Christ; in five, it is applied to the existence of God or Christ *who liveth forever;* in four it is predicated of the kingdom or dominion of Christ; in one, of the word of God; in eighteen it is used in the sense of *ever*, with a negative *never*, and in a great majority of these cases it is applied to something which Christ is or does; in seven it expresses an indefinite period in ages past, ages long ago; in nine it is applied to the future happiness of the righteous; and in five to the punishment of the wicked. In the remaining passages it is used in the sense of *age* or *world* (properly *world-time*) either present or future, Jewish or Christian. It is not used in the sense of lifetime or generation; the Greek of the New Testament, like that of the Septuagint, uses other words (*ἡλικία* and *γενεά*) to express the age or period of men's lives.

Of the sixty-six undisputed passages in which *αἰώνιος* is employed in the Greek Testament, fifty-one are used in relation to the life and happiness of the righteous in such expressions as *eternal life*, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, *everlasting habitations*, *τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς* or *οἰκίαν αἰωνίον*, *eternal salvation*, *σωτηρίας αἰώνιον*, *eternal inheritance*, *αἰωνίου κληρονομίας*, *the everlasting kingdom*, *εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν*, *his own* (God's) *eternal glory*, *εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον*

*αὐτοῦ δόξαν*, etc., etc.; two have respect to God, *τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ*, or his honor or glory, *ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον*; three or four to the *gospel*, the *covenant*, the *Spirit*, (of Christ or of God,) and *the things which are not seen;* three to past ages long since or eternal, *χρόνοις αἰωνίοις*, or *πρὸ χρονων αἰωνίων*; seven relate to *future punishment;* and in one the word is used to express the duration of the period, *through time and through eternity*, during which Philemon would have and enjoy Onesimus in contrast with the temporary separation which preceded it, *ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς*, *separated for a season that you may have him back forever, not as a servant but a brother beloved and in the Lord.*

This synopsis, in which I have taken the counting of Professor Stuart, (On Future Punishment,) withouttaking the pains to verify it, only revising his classification so that I am willing to be responsible for its substantial correctness, shows beyond dispute that the words under consideration are the words by which the writers of the New Testament were accustomed to express their strongest conceptions of eternity; that if the idea of duration without end is to be found anywhere in the Greek Scriptures, it is expressed in these words; and, furthermore, that if the idea is not expressed in these words, it cannot be expressed by any other words in the Greek language. Especially with those pluralities and reduplications which seem to grow with the growth of the Scriptures and the Church, and to reach their culmination in the concluding book of the sacred canon, the *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* which is used over and over again to express the duration of the torment of the worshipers of the beast and the false prophet, of the worship and service of the saints and their reign with Christ, and of the glory and honor and dominion and power of Him that liveth and reigneth forever and ever,—in such passages we cannot but feel that language has reached its utmost limit in the vivid expression of the "forever evermore, the ages of ages, worlds of worlds, eternities of eternities," which after all do not measure that immeasurable duration.

Now these are the words which our Lord employs, with more calmness, but with no less clearness and certainty, to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. And in view of the usages of the translators of the Old Testament and the writers of the New, when HE WHO IS TO BE THE JUDGE, in describing the scenes of the last judgment, uses such language as this, (Matt. xxv, 41:) "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye accursed, into the fire, the everlasting fire, that has been prepared for the devil and his angels," *τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ*,—the same thing manifestly, under another image, with "the everlasting chains under darkness," *δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον*, in which the angels that kept not their first estate are "reserved unto the judgment of the great day," (Jude 6,) and when he concludes his description of the grand and awful scene by saying: "These shall go away into

punishment everlasting, *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, but the righteous into life everlasting," *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, must he not have meant, must he not have been understood by all who heard him to mean, that as long as the soul shall exist, as long as the blessedness of the righteous shall continue, as long as God shall live and reign, as long as his character shall remain unchanged and his purposes stand fast, as long as he shall be worshiped and enjoyed by the saints and angels in heaven, so long shall the wicked be punished with the devil and his angels? And is not the plain teaching of this text confirmed and established by the unquenchable fire, the undying worm, the impassable gulf, the unpardonable sin, the *everlasting* sin, *αἰώνιον ἁμαρτήματος*, which is now the most approved reading of Mark iii, 29, and therefore inevitable everlasting misery, the wrath of God *abiding* on unbelievers, their death *in* sin wherein there is no life in them, and they *shall not see* life, in other words, *eternal* death, answering to the eternal *sin* and inseparable from it, as effect from cause, which, as we have seen, run parallel in all Christ's teachings, with the eternal life and blessedness of the righteous? What an impeachment of his *honesty* and *integrity*, as well as his wisdom and goodness, to suppose that *He*, the Judge, could have used such language as this, so certain to be understood as teaching the endless punishment of the wicked, if it was not really to be endless! —Pp. 223–228.

No topic of theology is at the present hour so prominently in the public mind as this. In November last, in a small Massachusetts village, a Congregational Council assembled for the purpose of installing a pastor. It was found that the candidate, a gentleman of unimpeachable purity of life, held the question of the eternity of future punishment to be an open one, and that he must so teach if he taught any thing on the subject. The Council declined to install him, and, as we think, very properly. The question was not one of recognition of Christian character, but rather of credentials of correctness as a Christian teacher on a point of faith historically held important in the denomination. It could not consistently have done otherwise than it did. Our own Church admits to membership on the very broad platform of the Twenty-five Articles, on which, with the exception of a single clause, perhaps all evangelical Christendom might stand; yet they whom she sends forth as her accredited teachers are first tested by the more rigid Wesleyan-Arminian standard. Our Universalist friends would readily permit a Trinitarian, and a believer in eternal punishment, in the pew, but would they install him in their pastorate?

The action of the Council, by the aid of the telegraph and the secular press, was given a sudden and wide publicity, and became the occasion of a simultaneous assault all along the line. A large class of newspaper writers are unfriendly to evangelical religion, and would gladly make out that hell is a fiction. Much of the popular literature of the day is permeated with the sentimentalism that arrays a fatherly sympathy against the justice of God as a moral Governor. The Universalism of forty years ago, that denied all punishment after death, and opened heaven with its glories to a Paine and an Ingersoll reeking with blasphemies, has been compelled to change its face, and proclaim for impenitent sinners a punishment beyond the grave. It may be of a thousand years' duration; it may be a million: but somewhere in the ages of eternity it will come to an end. If it can be made clear that there is a certainty of getting out of hell, even at the end of a million of years, the getting in is to multitudes seemingly a matter of small moment. "My friend," once said the venerable Frederic Upham, "I recommend you if hell does not last but a fortnight, to keep out of it."

The plan and purpose of God were most certainly the ultimate salvation of the whole race, which only the perverseness of the race itself could defeat. That perverseness is continually manifest, in spite of all the appliances of infinite love, and there is no known reason why it may not continue the same forever. We carry with us beyond the grave the characters with which we come to our final hour of earth. In so far as any change thereafter is a question of the power of God, the case is not changed at all by the passage into eternity, for omnipotence can no more trespass upon or force moral freedom there than it can here. It is, then, a false putting of the case to say that God can stop men's sinning if he will. He can, indeed, stop it, as he did in Noah's time by the sweeping destruction of the flood; but destruction is not salvation. And who shall say that some men in the exercise of their freedom and indulgence of their hate will not forever choose sin, and determinedly refuse any and all terms of reconciliation with God, even were reconciliation possible after death?

We may be sure that God will be forever true both to himself and to man, and he will, therefore, whatever may be the

outcome, deal with man in accordance with the laws of the nature which he has given him. One of those laws is the permanence of character. We commonly expect him whose character is formed to continue what he has become. The apostasy from Christ of John Wesley or Jonathan Edwards in old age would have shocked the world: it had become a moral impossibility; and it is well known that the conversion of an aged sinner is seldom witnessed. Character hardens and solidifies with the passing years, and opposing motives and appeals steadily lose their power. This law men carry with them into the future world, both the saint into paradise, and the wicked into perdition; and character will abide and go on hardening and solidifying. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Put with this the law of superinduced inability. Closing the eyes to the light, and refusing to hear and obey the truth, weaken and sometimes destroy the power to see and hear and obey. Willful and long persistence in sin results in inability to repent. Some of the Jews in our Saviour's time furnish a sad illustration: "Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, . . . therefore they could not believe." They *did not*—then, they *could not*. Now, if a continued refusal or neglect of the Gospel may thus ingrain the character and induce increasing diminution of power to repent in this world, and the soul carries its laws with it into eternity, how shall he repent there who has here utterly squandered and destroyed his soul's power of repentance?

But repentance is not the prescribed condition of salvation. The rich man in torment repented, but it availed him nothing. It is too often forgotten by debaters on this subject that the moral government under which we are living is one of recovery of fallen and lost men through a redemptive scheme. "The wrath of God abideth" on all those who refuse acceptance of Christ as a Saviour, while no one who comes to him is or will be rejected. Repentance blots out no sin: faith in Jesus blots out all sin. The proclamation of mercy is to all who will take him as their mediator, and the dying sinner of a hundred years, believing, finds mercy, while the sinner of a day, unbelieving, finds none. The point of test is in their

treatment of Christ. And, as here the crowning sin is in rejection of him, the chief element in the final condemnation will be, not the number, or greatness, or long continuance of sin committed, but the neglect of the salvation offered and the failure to love Christ. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema:" and from this lies no appeal. Now, we have "one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus," the crucified Saviour, the living Intercessor, the final Judge. The period is coming when his work of mediation will cease; when, immediately following the final judgment, "he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," said Jesus; and his work of intercession will then be forever done. If, then, salvation is attainable only by faith in him, and his redemptive work ceases with this delivering up of the mediatorial kingdom, deliverance for the unsaved is thenceforth impossible.

There is coming a day of judgment. At that time there will be two classes of men, the righteous and the wicked, standing before the Son of Man, their final Judge. The decisions of that day will be judicial decisions; its awards will be judicial awards; and *both must stand until they are judicially reversed.* Any other principle would make an earthly government a fluctuation and a sham, full of uncertainty and instability; and God will expose his government to no such possibilities or imputations. Among men, if new testimony is found, if the law has been misinterpreted, or if injustice has been done, a remedy is found in a new trial or an appeal to a higher court; nevertheless, the decree stands until it is reversed. But in that great day the Judge will know the law, and will make no mistake in its interpretation, and the whole testimony will be before him. His awards will be judicial awards. There is no higher court; there can be no new trial; there is no reassembling of the tribunal; there will be no suspension of the pronounced doom. The awards of that day must stand forever, without possibility or hope of reversal. The sentence, "Depart from me, ye cursed," will be irrevocable. Pardon on repentance is not the divine plan now, and it cannot be then. Pardon in the exercise of sovereignty, in abrogation of the decree of the

great tribunal, would be a contradiction of himself which God will not perform. And if to any this seems severe and shocking, let him remember the infinite love which gave the Son of God to prevent it, the tears and pleadings of Jesus over lost men, the agonies of Gethsemane, the shed blood of Calvary, the warnings and invitations of the Gospel, and the movings of the blessed Spirit, and that, in spite of all God can do, men refuse to be saved. It *is* shocking; but if men *will* be eternally damned, how can God prevent it?

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, January–February, 1878. (New York.)—1. Charles Sumner. 2. A Crumb for the "Modern Symposium." 3. The Art of Dramatic Composition. Part I. 4. General Amnesty. 5. The English Aristocracy. 6. Reminiscences of the Civil War. 7. The Origin of the Italian Language. 8. Ephesus, Cyprus, and Mycenæ. 9. Capture of Kars, and Fall of Plevna. 10. Currency Quacks, and the Silver Bill.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March–April, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Army of the United States. Part I. With Letters of Generals Sherman and Hancock. 2. English and American Universities Compared. 3. Stonewall Jackson and the Valley Campaign. 4. The Death-Struggle of the Republican Party. 5. The Position of the Jews in America. 6. The Political Alliance of the South and the West. 7. The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment.

This Review is well fulfilling its promise of the discussion of living topics of the day. The special article of this number is the last, covering thirty-five pages, and furnished by six different writers, President Porter opening and closing the discussion. Congregationalist, Roman Catholic, Unitarian, Baptist, and Universalist, are represented, while Mr. Frothingham speaks for himself with little thought and sufficient sneer and coarseness to incite the query whether even Mr. Ingersoll could have done that part more gracelessly. Dr. Bellows very thoughtfully remarks: "We confess that our philosophy of man's perfect moral freedom casts very solemn and threatening shadows upon the future of willful and impenitent transgressors. We do not see how men can be made holy against their wills, or be less than miserable, so long as they will not be holy; and our observation and experience of human willfulness in this world does not encourage us to hope that it may not continue for indefinite and practically dateless periods in new states of being. Fools alone make a mock at sin." Sadly true; and why "it may not continue" forever, who can tell, however much he may "hope?"

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, January, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Origen and Universalism. 2. The Primary Source of Religious Evidence. 3. Universalist Conventions and Creeds. 4. Moral Freedom and Moral Evil. 5. Johnson's China. 6. The Vulgate Version and the Catholic Church. 7. Henry Ward Beecher on Future Punishment and the Future Life. 8. The General Convention.

The article on "Moral Freedom and Moral Evil" contains some very forcible utterances on the question of the impreventability of sin in a free moral being, which have, at the present time, a more than usual interest, because of their bearing on current discussions. The position taken is the familiar one that it is impossible for God to work contradictions. But the graveling query spontaneously arises: How can the omnipotence which cannot prevent sinning in this world prevent it or stop it in the future world?

## *English Reviews.*

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. Thirteenth year. January, 1878. (London.)—1. "Disestablishment." 2. John Stuart Mill's Philosophy Tested. 3. The Little Health of Ladies. 4. On the Teaching of Natural Philosophy. 5. China, England, and Opium: The Chiefoo Convention. 6. Government Education: Thirty Years Past and Thirty Years to Come. 7. The Discoveries at Mycenæ and Cyprus. 8. The County Franchise. 9. Dog-Poison in Man.

February, 1878.—1. On the Origin of Reason. 2. The Stability of our Indian Empire. 3. Forest and Field Myths. 4. France before the Outbreak of the Revolution. 5. The New Star which Faded into Star-Mist. 6. What is in Store for Europe. 7. The Three Conflicting Theories of Church and State. 8. Madonna Dünya. 9. England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Cromartie Papers. 2. Harvey and Cesalpino. 3. The French in Indo-China. 4. Correspondence of Charles Sumner. 5. Titian. 6. Third Volume of the Life of the Prince Consort. 7. Stanley's Discoveries and the Future of Africa. 8. The Military Power of Russia. 9. Dr. Schliemann's Exploration of Mycenæ. 10. The Coming Conclave. 11. Principles and Prospects of the Liberal Party.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (London.)—1. Assyriology. 2. Indian Famines. 3. Atheism, Evolution, and Theology. 4. The Eternal Life in the Gospel of St. John. 5. Van Laun's History of French Literature. 6. The Pope, the Kings, and the People. 7. Catechization.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Renaissance in Italy and in England. 2. Scientific Lectures: their Use and Abuse. 3. Schliemann's Mycenæ. 4. March of an English Generation through Life. 5. Sir Erskine May's Democracy in Europe. 6. A French Critic on Goethe. 7. Railway Accidents. 8. Lord Melbourne. 9. The House of Commons and the Obstructive Party. 10. The Meeting of Parliament.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1878. (New York.)—1. Democracy in Europe. 2. Charlotte Bronté. 3. The Education of Girls: their Admissibility to Universities. 4. Lessing: His Life and Writings. 5. The Indian Famine: How dealt with in Western India. 6. Charles Sumner. 7. The Telephone. 8. India and our Colonial Empire.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1878. (London.)—1. The Mikado's Empire. 2. The Americans in Turkey. 3. Savings and Savings Banks. 4. Precious Stones. 5. Capital and Labor: The Principles and Facts on Both Sides. 6. Comprehension. 7. Parody and Parodists. 8. Professor Henry Rogers.

The article on "The Americans in Turkey" is highly complimentary to our country, and especially to the missionaries of the American Board, but is only a just recognition of the actual facts. The religious reformation is purposely left out of the account, and attention is confined to some of the incidental and secular results of the labors of the last half century. The explorations of Fisk, Parsons, King, Goodell, Smith, and Dwight, in Asia Minor, Cappadocia, Armenia, and Persia, followed by Robinson in Palestine, together with Thomson's "The Land and the Book," and Van Lennep's "Bible Lands," are noticed at length. The travels of the missionaries were mostly connected with the furtherance of their great work; yet, as men of culture, they noted numberless facts, and gave them to the world. Nor is the value of their labors any the less, because travelers and exploration societies, stimulated by what they have done, have since been crowding in their footsteps, and triangulating and mapping out the country. The contrast between the American and the Oriental is thus vividly described:—

No one can fail to notice, at the outset, the sharp contrast between the American and the Oriental. The Oriental is sluggish almost to indifference; he dreads change, he easily submits to the decrees of fate; he has a profound regard for authority, and is disposed to allow all things to take their own course. To him time is of little value, success is not essential. Abundance of sleep, plenty of food, pipes, coffee, narcotics, long stories, formality, dignity, all these enter largely into the daily life of the dweller in the East. How strangely different the American. Nervous, impatient, short and sharp in speech, always in a hurry, despising formality, careless of his dress, unwilling to sleep till exhausted by overwork, ready to put his dissecting knife into everything, determined to make every undertaking a success, self-confident, filled with the conviction that American ideas are destined to lead the world, working always for definite results, and adapting his means to the end in a most positive way, who can predict the result of bringing this restless New Englander face to face with the slow and dignified Oriental? Strange as it may seem, we believe that the very sharpness of this contrast has been one of the main elements in the success of the Americans in dealing with the people of Turkey. The Oriental needed something bold and positive to arouse him, and this he has found in the Americans; for it must be confessed that whatever may be the short-comings of the citi-

zens of the great Republic, a want of positiveness and self-confidence is not one of them.—Pp. 32, 33.

The literary work done is immense. School books of all grades, books, tracts, and newspapers are published in different languages: Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, Hebrew, Spanish, Turkish, and Kūrdish, besides the European. Some of these books are published in several languages, notably, the Bible, which is issued in Turkish, with Arabic, Armenian, and Greek characters, as prepared by Drs. Van Dyck, Goodell, and Schauffler. The amount of printing done from the first at Constantinople and Beirut reaches the enormous amount of four hundred and fifty million pages. Education, as well as the press, is made an auxiliary in the work of evangelization. About three hundred common schools have been established; fifteen girls' boarding schools; a number of high schools for young men; seven theological schools, and three colleges, at Constantinople, Beirut, and Aintab, with a fourth projected, Armenia College, at Kharpoot. Robert College, to which the founder, Mr. Christopher R. Robert, of New York, has given the sum of two hundred thousand dollars, had at the beginning of the war two hundred and twenty-five students, from fourteen different nationalities. We would be glad to notice the work of American physicians, but have space only for the following on the improved condition of woman:—

When the Americans arrived in Turkey they found the women of the country in a degraded condition. There was no public sentiment, either among Moslems or Christians, in favor of the education of women. The general opinion seemed to be that the female sex has almost no intellectual capacity. The first efforts of the Americans to make the women sharers in intellectual progress and refinement were met with opposition and often with derisive laughter. Let us ask, then, What have the Americans accomplished in Turkey in respect to the improvement of women? We answer, They have created a new public sentiment in favor of the education of women.

That such a sentiment now exists to a large extent is shown in a variety of ways. Several thousands of adult women have been taught to read, and this fact attracts a great deal of attention among all classes of the people. The husbands and relations of these female readers are proud of them. "My wife knows how to read," is a remark now often made with evident satisfaction. True, these women have not gone beyond simple reading, but that alone is a great boon: it opens to them a new world.

This new public sentiment is shown by the interest taken in the schools that have been established by the Americans, especially for the education of girls. Annual examinations of these schools are held, and it is on these occasions that the public sympathy manifests itself. Pashas, civil and military officers of high rank, the ecclesiastics and wealthy men of all the different nationalities, are reported as attending their examinations, and as expressing their hearty approval of the efforts that are made by the Americans for improving the condition of the women of Turkey. The American ladies who have had charge of these schools have made great use of the press in enlightening the community on this subject. . . . One fact has struck our attention most forcibly on examining this subject, which is, that those in Turkey who have been quick to avail themselves of the advantages placed before them by the Americans belong uniformly to the *Christian* and not to the *Mohammedan* races, Greeks, Copts, Armenians, and Bulgarians, not Kûrds, Turcomans, Turks, or Arabs.—Pp. 57–58.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW. January, 1878. (London.)—1. Old Testament Morality. 2. Agnosticism and Dogmatism, from a Puritan Point of View. 3. The Parables of Christ, with Special Reference to their Place in his Teachings. 4. Biographies of 1876: Kingsley, Campbell, Martineau, Arnot. 5. The Book of Deuteronomy. 6. The Philosophy of Punishment. 7. African Explorations and Missions. 8. Opportunity the Authoritative Guide of the Church.

Recent criticism disputes the account which the Book of Deuteronomy gives of itself, and ascribes to it a later authorship. Dr. Murphy, the commentator, after examining the several difficulties alleged, strikes out another line of argument showing some of the difficulties the critics must encounter. After showing that inspiration involves at least two things—first, the truth, and next the higher than human scope of the inspired writing, he remarks:—

The only point, however, which is to our present purpose, is the adaptation of the revelation to the present emergency. An inspired book enunciates principles of truth, and modes of applying them to the condition of man. A principle is always the same, but the mode of its application varies with the occasion. Hence, an addition to the volume of inspiration involves, if not new principles, at all events new modes of applying old principles to the new situation of affairs. This is what may be called the development of the truth in Scripture.

The advocates of the late composition of Deuteronomy make much of this law of development. On the fancied ground of the anachronisms already discussed, they have brought down the book to the age of Samuel or Jeremiah or Ezra. This result, however, only involves them in a sea of perplexities. First of all, the few traces of later events alleged to be found in the book turn out to be,

not mistakes of the writer, but hasty misconceptions of the critic. And when these have been discounted, the book itself proves to be composed entirely of instances of that precise stage of development which was needed at the close of the ministry of Moses. It is found to reveal new principles and new modes of applying the old, to provide for new needs of the coming era, and thus to exhibit a process of development adapted only to the time in which the author states it to have been written.

1. Among the principles and modes of application are the following: The great law of love is here laid down. This principle of morality is implied, indeed, in the ten commandments, and affirmed in its minor application to the creature in Lev. xix, 18, but here only explicitly announced in its major application to the Creator. This is finely suited to be a last word of the great lawgiver. A mode of its application is the year of release, by which forbearance toward our dependent brother is learned and practiced. This institution comes in properly on the eve of the settlement. Another principle is, that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." Deut. vii, 3. Man is a moral and accountable being, and his life, therefore, depends, not on eating bread only, but on believing and obeying the revealed will of God. This was drawn from the experience of the wilderness. Another is, that the moral law is the test of prophetic teaching. If a prophet say, "Let us go after other gods," reject him and his teachings, even though it be supported by a sign or a wonder. (Deut. xiii.) This was suitable after the experience of Egypt, and before entering Canaan. It is a principle that man, especially when fallen, needs the teaching of his Maker. Hence the advantage of a written revelation. (Deut. xxx.) This is seasonable, when the first grand installment of the Scripture was handed over to the leaders of the people. All these principles were more suitable for the final addresses of Moses than for any other occasion.

2. Numerous are the provisions which this book makes for the new needs arising at the conquest of the promised land. It introduces in fifteen chapters (xii–xxvi) a whole series of alterations in the institutions of the theocracy adapted to the new state of things. The grand change was the choice of a place where the priest would offer the propitiatory sacrifice, and make intercession with God for the people, and where the passover and other annual feasts should for the future be celebrated. A higher court consisting of the priests and elders of the people is instituted for the trial of more difficult cases. (Deut. xvii.) Directions are given for the renewal of the covenant between God and his people. All these arrangements were adapted to the closing scene of the wilderness life, and to no other time before or after.

3. The whole tenor of the book, therefore, exhibits the development of doctrine requisite for the pause of the people of God on the banks of the Jordan. And when the candid reader calls to mind the vast array of passages in Exodus, Leviticus, and Num-

bers that plainly precede Deuteronomy, and the transactions in the books of Joshua and Judges, which as plainly follow it, he cannot fail to be convinced that this book is the link necessary to connect the law with the history of the chosen people.—Pp. 122–125.

## *German Reviews.*

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Riehm and Dr. Köstlin. Second Number. 1878. *Essays:* 1. KATTENBUSCH, Critical Studies on Symbolics, (Second Article.) 2. BRAUN, The Religious and Moral Views of Adam Smith. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. DOEDES, A Mandate of Jesus Christ, by Nicholas Herman. 2. SEIDEMANN, Spengler's Correspondence. 3. KOENIG, The Rules of Pachomius. *Reviews:* 1. MEZGER, History of the German Translations of the Bible in the Reformed Church of Switzerland, reviewed by STRACK. 2. FRENSDORFF, The *Massora Magna*, reviewed by STRACK.

Adam Smith's famous work, "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," was published in 1776. It was the first complete and systematic statement of the principles of political economy, and has had an extraordinary influence upon the development of this science. Though the author of the above article on Adam Smith cannot consent to Buckle's opinion, who calls Smith's book "probably the most important work which has ever been written," he also contends that perhaps the influence of no other work has been "so immediately practical." "What Smith wrote down in his quiet study," he says, "has been taken up and realized by the men of action and of industry; by the statesmen and the representative assemblies. Its fruit we behold in the economical development of the last century; in the economical and social condition of the present age, with its sunny and shady sides. Certainly this condition demands the earnest consideration of theologians, who have to test and to comprehend all departments of life from a moral and Christian stand-point. For is not the economical life of a nation closely connected with its moral and religious condition? If we take, for instance, two of the most striking and the most abnormal economical phenomena of the present day—the swindling stock companies and socialism—which sustain to Smith's system the relation of necessary consequences, they reveal a frightful wreck of moral and religious life. Is Smith in any way responsible for them? At all events, it is of interest to look into his moral and re-

ligious views, and to examine their eventual connection with his economical theories. This is the object of our essay." Accordingly, the author briefly recapitulates the fundamental principles of Smith's economical system, and then gives a full statement of his views on religion and morality. The result at which he arrives is stated by him as follows: "Smith's fault lies not in an irreligious materialism or atomistic egotism, which have been falsely attributed to him, but in his moral and economical optimism. He does not know sin, the radical evil in man and the radical evil in the world. Against this evil in the world, and for an approximate realization of a general well-being, there is no other remedy than the struggle against the sin of egotism. As long as any moral duties are assigned to the State, there can be no doubt that the State has the right and the task to keep down the sinful egotism of individuals for the benefit of others, and for their own moral benefit. This should be done by laws which limit the absolute economical freedom, and thus make their abuse impossible. But as long as the State does not fulfill this duty, exertions should be made to oppose the principle of egotism by means of free associations, and to reduce as much as possible the existing misery."

In a postscript to his article the author briefly refers to a new work by Dr. Oncken, a well-known German historian, on "Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant: The Harmony and the Mutual Relation of their Views on Ethics, State, and Economy," (*Adam Smith und Immanuel Kant: der Einklang und das Wechselverhältniss ihrer Lehren*, etc. Vol. I. Leipsic. 1877.) He enumerates the points in which he agrees and in which he disagrees with Oncken.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) September, 1877.—1. STANLEY, Spiritual Religion; Translation of a Sermon of Dean Stanley, of Westminster. 2. GABEREL, Five Years in Russian America. 3. GODET, A Commentary on the New Testament. 4. STAFFER, Some Notes on the Reform of Worship. 5. SECRETAN, The Philosophy of Liberty.

October.—1. BARDOUX, American Moralists, (Channing and Parker.) 2. GABEREL, Five Years in Russian America. (Second Article.) 3. PRESSENSÉ, A Manifesto of Ecclesiastical Reaction in the Reformed Church. 4. LICHTENBERGER, The Festivals of Upsala.

November.—1. PRESSENSÉ, The Evangelical Preparation at the time of the Patriarchs. 2. CADÉNE, Coligny. 3. RUFFET, The Gospel and Liberty. 4. SCHAFFER, Insanity.

December.—1. PRESSENSÉ, The Evangelical Preparation at the Time of the Patriarchs. 2. GANFIES, The Project of Transferring the Theological Faculty of the Reformed Church from Montauban to Paris. 3. SCHAFFER, Insanity, (Second Article.)

January, 1878.—EDOUARD NAVILLE, Moral Liberty. 2. STAFFER, The Christianity of the First Centuries. 3. MILLARD, Catholic Theology and Worship.

February.—1. EDOUARD NAVILLE, The Israelites in Egypt. 2. SUCHARD, Darwinism. 3. IRMA S., The Curé and the Pastor.

The author of the article, The Israelites in Egypt, undertakes to show how much the interesting discoveries which have been made in Egypt enlarge the knowledge which hitherto had been derived on this subject from the Bible. The range of his discussion is, however, wider than the title of the article seems to indicate, for it really traces the entire history of the Semites in Egypt. The first immigration of people of this race into Egypt, according to him, took place during the reign of the Twelfth Dynasty. In a tomb of an officer of the Twelfth Dynasty we see a picture representing a Semitic family of a nation called the Amso, or shepherds, which had just settled in the country, to the number of thirty-seven persons, and which an overseer presents to the officers. These strangers, of a type very much resembling the Israelites, carrying with them their arms and musical instruments. The women are wearing long variegated dresses; the children are sitting on donkeys, and the chief, Abesha, which recalls the biblical name Abishai, offers to the officers two wild goats. It has sometimes been supposed that these strangers must have belonged to the family of Jacob; but the Twelfth Dynasty long preceded the time of Abraham, and many centuries had yet to pass before the Israelites entered the valley of the Nile. The first Semitic immigrants settled in the Delta; they were employed to tend

the cattle, and gradually they became so firmly settled that, notwithstanding the great wars which followed, they were never wholly expelled from the country, and even at the present day the population which resides around Lake Menzaleh preserves the Semitic type. Thus, gradually, during the reign of the Pharaohs of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties, lower Egypt became densely peopled by Semites, who undoubtedly remained in connection with the nations of the same race which lived on the eastern border of Egypt. About two thousand years before our era a people coming from Mesopotamia, and driven thence by the trouble which characterized the foundation of the first Chaldean empire, advanced toward Egypt. Perhaps they were called, and undoubtedly they were aided, by their co-nationalists, and settled in the Delta. At all events, they conquered Egypt. These were the famous Hyksos. Herodotus, Diodorus, and Josephus call them barbarians, and say that they devastated the country with fire and sword. They especially destroyed what was dearest to the Egyptians, their religious monuments. Our present knowledge of the ancient history of Egypt does not suffice to explain why the flourishing kingdom of Egypt was unable to offer a more successful resistance to this invasion. While the Hyksos ruled the Delta, descendants of the Pharaohs, being to a greater or lesser extent vassals of the Hyksos, maintained themselves at Thebes. It was during the reign of the Hyksos that Abraham, then Joseph, and then Jacob and his family, arrived in Egypt. Of course, the Hyksos were detested by the Egyptians, and the Egyptian monuments, therefore, refer but rarely to them. Still they furnish some information. Their capital was neither Memphis nor Thebes, which latter city they probably never occupied, but Tanis, now San, on one of the eastern branches of the Nile, in the center of the Semitic population which were their most faithful adherents. Like all barbarous conquerors of civilized countries, the Hyksos were in many ways affected by the superior civilization of the Egyptians; they adopted the language of the country, and though they preserved the worship of their national god, Set, (or Baal,) they erected to him temples resembling those erected to the Egyptian gods. Only a few years ago, M. Mariette, one of the most successful discoverers of Egyptian antiquities, found

at San sphinxes dating from Aphophis, the last king of the Hyksos, which had been placed at the entrance of the great temple of that city, and which bear hieroglyphic inscriptions of the same character and in the same language as those of the Pharaohs. According to the Christian writer Syncellus, it was this king Aphophis who made Joseph his prime minister, and during whose reign Jacob and his family settled in Egypt. This, of course, accords very well with the account of the Scriptures. A Hyksos or Semite king had strong reasons to be favorable to the kindred Israelites, and to favor their settlement in Egypt. Professor Brugsch, or as he calls himself since he has entered the service of the Khedive, Brugsch Bey, believes himself to have discovered in the Egyptian monuments a direct reference to Joseph. In the tomb of an officer who must have lived under the last kings of the Hyksos, though he was in the service of one of the native princes who revolted against them, we read: "I have collected corn, for I am a friend of the god of the harvest; I have been vigilant at the time of the sowing, and when there was a famine for several years, I have furnished wheat to the city." Brugsch thinks these words must refer to the famine at the time of Joseph. To the end of the rule of the Hyksos the book of Exodus refers only by this brief statement, that a new king arose up over Egypt who knew not Joseph. From the Egyptian annals we receive a detailed account of this interesting turning-point in Egyptian history. A native prince, Rasgenen, who was governor of Thebes, under the sovereignty of Aphophis, believing the time to have come for shaking off the yoke of the detested foreigners, provoked a war by a religious revolt. He declared boldly that he would never worship any other god but Amun-Ra, the national deity of Thebes, and this declaration quickly led to the war which ended in the overthrow of the Hyksos. For one hundred and fifty years the Egyptians fought for the recovery of their national independence; then Avaris, the last stronghold of the Hyksos fell, and, instead of being the masters, they became the subjects of the Egyptian Pharaohs. Of course, the new rulers of the native dynasties "knew not Joseph," but probably did every thing they could to destroy every reminiscence of him. From the researches of Lepsius it results that the king who particularly oppressed the Israelites

was Rameses II., second king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and it is quite generally assumed that the king during whose reign the exodus took place was Manephthah I., the son of Rameses II. The place where the Israelites passed the Red Sea is at present the subject of an interesting controversy between the Egyptologists; it is believed to have been a little more to the north than has been heretofore assumed.

## ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### MOHAMMEDANISM.

AT a time when the whole Mohammedan world has suffered a terrible blow by the defeat of Turkey, it is of great interest to cast a glance at the condition of the Mohammedans under the two greatest Christian Governments—the British and the Russian. It is a remarkable fact that the Queen of England rules over a larger number of Mohammedans than any Mohammedan prince, and that by far the best institutions of learning for Mohammedans are now found in the dominions of Russia and England. A distinguished German traveler and ethnological writer, E. von Schlagintweit, has recently published a very interesting article on the Mohammedans of the Russian and British empires, the substance of which we give in the following lines:—

In European Russia the Mohammedans number 2,359,372, or three and a third per cent. of the total population. Of this number 710,905 are in the Province of Ufa, 451,786 in Kazan, 250,802 in Orenburg, and 116,206 in Taurida, inclusive of the Crimea. In Asiatic Russia there are 1,960,000 (or ninety-three per cent. of the total population) Mohammedans in the Caucasus; 61,803, or barely two per cent. in Siberia; 1,200,000, or seventy per cent., in the Kirghiz Steppe; and 2,350,000, or ninety per cent., in Turkestan. Assuming the total population of Russia to be 86,177,906, we find that the Mohammedans form 9.1 per cent. of the total population. These 8,000,000 Mohammedans are, with the exception of a very few, Sunnites, who regard themselves as the only true descendants of the prophet, and who regard the Sultan of Turkey as the head of their Church. The relation of Mohammedanism to the State Church is determined by article 40, *et seq.*, of the first volume of the Russian law, as follows: "The ruling faith in the Russian empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of faith. Religious liberty is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and Pagans, so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors." This law, however, is interpreted in such a manner as to mean that religious liberty is assured only so long as a member of an unorthodox Church

adheres to the faith in which he was born; but all unorthodox Churches are forbidden to receive as members proselytes from other Churches. A severe penalty is imposed on any one who leaves a Christian for a non-Christian religion. Lutherans and Roman Catholics are forbidden to convert to Christianity a Mohammedan who is a Russian subject, while a non-Russian Mohammedan may be received in any of the Christian Churches permitted in the empire. These laws have been very strictly executed. On several occasions Tartars, who had embraced Christianity, and had afterward returned to their original faith, were punished by imprisonment, while no attention was paid to the excuse that the relapse had been occasioned by an unbearable pressure exercised by orthodox priests, as well as by their avariciousness. On the other hand, the Government aids the orthodox clergy in every possible manner in their efforts to convert the unfaithful. In Kazan, one of the principal seats of the Mohammedan population of European Russia, the brotherhood of St. Gurij was formed in 1870 for the purpose of converting the Mohammedans and Pagans on the Volga. This brotherhood had established up to 1874 115 schools, with their own means, which were attended by 1,992 male and 339 female Tartars, besides members of other nationalities.

The civil rights of the Mohammedans are like those of the Jews, limited by special laws. They are, indeed, eligible to municipal and government offices under the same conditions as Christians; but in city councils, *e. g.*, the non-Christian members must not exceed one third of the total number of members, while the office of mayor is entirely closed to them. The criminal statistics are particularly interesting. Among all the inhabitants of the empire the Mohammedans occupy the lowest rank with regard to the more serious crimes, there being but one conviction among 5,779 Mohammedans against 2,710 orthodox Christians. With regard to the less serious offenses, the Mohammedans occupy the fifth rank; but even this unfavorable relation is caused by the numerous convictions for evasion of military duty. Theft, however, is also of common occurrence among them. The Mohammedans are generally very prompt in observing their duties to the State, with the exception of those arising from the general liability to military service. The service in the regular army is to this day so unpopular among the Tartars of the Crimea, that in 1876 the Government was forced to take severe measures to prevent a wholesale emigration to Turkey. An official report states that the Tartars feared above all things that they would be forced to fight against their co-religionists, the Turks, and that they would be forced to eat pork, which is to them worse than death. But even before the declaration of war against Turkey, and during this war, the excitement was said to have subsided, and they were, with very few exceptions, loyal. The same was the case with the Mohammedans in Asiatic Russia.

In matters pertaining to their religion, the Mohammedans are granted complete liberty, although the Government takes care to be informed on the entire *personnel* of the clergy, their actions, etc. The highest ecclesi-

astical body in the Eastern governments of European Russia is the "Mohammedan Ecclesiastical College of Ufa." This College is elected, and fills all offices under its jurisdiction without the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Government. For the Mohammedan clergy of Central Asia the cities of Bokhara and Samarkand are to this day centers of learning; and the heads of the institutions of learning at these places are regarded as the preservers of the true faith. The colleges for theology and Mohammedan law (Madrasa or Medresseh) number several hundred. (In European Russia there are two hundred and fifty, of which several are attended by hundreds of students.) In these colleges Mohammedan science flourishes, without having ever been touched by so much as a breath of Western culture. The Government does not interfere in any manner in the inner affairs of these schools; does not oppose a journey to Mecca, and even permits priests, (Mollahs,) who have finished their education in Constantinople, Arabia, or Egypt, to hold a position upon their return to Russia. It was found that the Ulemas (the learned men) connected with the mosques or schools readily submit to any government, as this alone could secure to them the use of their legacies, (Vakuf,) their main source of income. Those brethren, however, who have had themselves declared saints, have become, in all Mohammedan countries, a perfect nuisance, and the sworn enemies of a well-regulated Government. The title of saint (Ishan) is easily obtained. The motives to obtain it are, however, very frequently the most dishonorable, while the saints themselves in many cases bear a very poor reputation. In Central Asia the majority of robberies are committed by the saints, and they are, therefore, avoided by the stationary population. The nomads, on the other hand, receive them with open arms, and here, among the roving sons of the Steppe, they find their true home. The Russian Government at first did not oppose them. The decrees of 1781 and 1785, on the contrary, opened to them the newly acquired Kirghiz Steppes. Their influence here was a very pernicious one. The Government, however, treats them at present more strictly. In 1873 a case occurred in Orenburg, where such a saint was banished to a government having no Mohammedan inhabitants. In the same manner the Russian Government proceeded against the saints in the Caucasus, while in Turkestan it watches the fanatical order of Nakshbandi very closely.

The popular school system among the Mohammedans was entirely reorganized by an Imperial decree of November 20, 1874. This decree placed the schools of the Tartars, the Bashkirs, and Kirghiz under the Imperial Ministry of Education, which informed its subordinates of this Act as follows: "The subordination of the Tartar non-Russian schools under this ministry is not only important in an educational, but also in a political, point of view. The Mussulmans' schools have been, up to this time, without any Government supervision, and, therefore, promoted among the people an anti-Russian sentiment, and a fanaticism which prevented the assimilation of the Tartar, etc., with the other inhabitants of Russia." According to Mohammedan views, every Mollah (priest)

is at the same time a teacher, while the school is near the mosque. Through these schools the Mollahs endeavor to bring their community under their influence, and to keep them away from their Russian neighbors. They are also decidedly opposed to any government supervision of these schools. The Government at first tried to establish teachers' seminaries for the education of teachers in these schools; and the decree of 1870, which ordered the establishment of these seminaries, provided, in order to do away with all prejudices, that the teachers of the Russian language should be, as far as possible, Mohammedans, and the Mollahs be permitted to attend all the lessons, so that they may convince themselves that nothing objectionable is taught. Even now the teachers in the Madrasas of the principal cities, like Kazan, speak Russian fluently, although they are all Mohammedans. The authorities are also actively engaged in the preparation of reading-books containing, besides tales and fables, incidents from Russian history, as well as facts from geography and natural history. This is a decided improvement, as, according to all authorities, like Shaw, Lerch and Vambery, the entire Turkish-Tartaric literature breathes "a spirit of religious mysticism, rose-colored sensual love, and reckless bravery emanating from the most bitter hate of the unbelievers." Even such old libraries as that of Kazan are completely wanting in works on the history and geography of Mohammedan countries; but it is expected that this want will be relieved in time by the Mohammedan students in the Russian high and secondary schools. In 1871 the Oriental faculty of the University of St. Petersburg was attended by thirty-six students. In the same year there were ninety-two Mohammedan students in the Russian gymnasia, of which the educational district of Kazan, with its forty-three per cent. of the total Mohammedan population, had forty-seven.

In East India 40,750,000 Mohammedans are British subjects, and about 7,000,000 Mohammedans are ruled by native princes. Of this number, 36,000,000 are distributed over Northern India. They predominate principally on the Western border, forming not less than eighty per cent. (around Peshawer even ninety-four per cent.) of the total population at any point between the Himalaya Mountains and the Indian Ocean. In the Punjab this figure falls to seventy, then to forty, and afterward in Hindustan to twenty and ten per cent. It is a strange fact that these low figures are found in the principal seats of the former Grand Moguls, who were deposed by the British. In Bengal, east of Calcutta, there is another wide belt, entering also from the sea-shore to the Himalayas, where Mohammedans nowhere fall below fifty per cent. of the total population, and in many cases reach eighty per cent., while in Central and Southern India they contribute but three per cent. of the total population. This distribution is explained by the fact that the Grand Moguls indeed settled in the principal region of Brahminism, but, in spite of all forcible measures, they could bring about but few conversions to their faith. The north-western part of the empire, however, where all the successive conquerors of India first entered upon this country, was a more favorable

field for Mohammedanism. Mohammedanism found its readiest converts among the lower classes, who had been up to that time held in subjection, and who hailed the new faith as a liberator from bondage and serfdom, and one which knew no caste.

A law of 1834 declared that religion should make no difference in the rights and privileges of the subjects of the East Indian Company; and Queen Victoria in her proclamation of November 1, 1858, upon assuming the government of India, reiterated this principle in the most emphatic manner. In conformity therewith the authorities were forbidden to speak of the non-Christian inhabitants of the Empire as Pagans, while the Government proceeded to remove the obstacles which excluded the Mohammedans from the Government offices. The appointment to the higher and well paid offices in India requires an examination, the necessary qualifications for which may be obtained by attending the secondary and higher schools. These schools were patterned, however, too much after similar European institutions; but in 1873 Hindu and Mohammedan works were substituted in place of the Latin and English classical works, and already more Mohammedans than Hindus apply for Government positions. The Anglo-Indian Government grants to all religious denominations the fullest liberty in the management of their own affairs. While formerly a Government commission had the casting vote in the boards of trustees of religious establishments, these functions were transferred, by a law of 1863, to a committee, whose members are in the first place appointed by the Government, and then have the power to fill vacancies. With regard to the political trustworthiness of the Mohammedans in India, it has been generally assumed that the British were hated by their Mohammedan subjects as their tyrants and oppressors. The Sepoy rebellion in 1857, the Patna conspiracy of 1863, and the assassination of numerous English officials by Mohammedans, notably that of the Viceroy, Lord Mayo, in 1872, were cited as proofs for this supposition. These acts are, however, offset by others of great loyalty. As in Russia, the Mohammedans furnish the smallest number of convicts, but, on the other hand, they form the greater part of the Anglo-Indian army, as well as of the native police, and, although while in camp it is necessary to subject them to strict discipline, they make excellent soldiers when under fire.

## Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

A new Commentary to the Gospel of Matthew (*Commentar über das Evangelium des Matthäus*) has been published by Professor C. F. Keil. The author is well known as one of the foremost representatives of the strictest Lutheran orthodoxy, who does not make the slightest concession to the critical and compromising schools of German theology, but

defends, in all particulars, the landmarks of orthodox Protestantism. Keil maintains that the first Gospel was written in the exact form which it now has, by Matthew, and that the assumption of a Hebrew original of the first Gospel rests on a confusion of it with the Gospel of the Hebrews. He repels the idea that there is any discrepancy between the statements of Matthew and those of the other Gospels, and contends that all the sermons and addresses reported in Matthew must be regarded as having been literally delivered in the shape in which the sacred volume transmits them to us. The thorough scholarship of the author, who has a very comprehensive knowledge of Hebrew antiquities, is admitted even by his opponents.

A new work on the "Life and Works of Tertullian" has been published by A. Hauck. (*Tertullian's Leben und Schriften*, 1877.) It is the fruit of many years' special studies, and a review of the work by Professor Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* says of it that it indicates a considerable progress over the treatment of this subject by Neander and Böhringer.

The Cardinal Archbishop of Cambrai, Peter d'Ailli, who was one of the representative men in the long struggle for the reformation of the Church in the fourteenth century, has been made the subject of a special work by Dr. P. Tschakert, a lecturer in the theological faculty of the University of Leipsic. (*Peter von Ailli*, Gotha, 1877.) The author had previously published a Latin dissertation on the "Theology of Peter d'Ailli," (*Petrus Alliacensis de ecclesia quid docuerit*, 1877,) and two articles in theological quarterlies of Germany on writings falsely attributed to the Cardinal of Cambrai. All these essays had been very favorably received, and had awakened a wish that their author might treat the subject in a comprehensive biographical work. This wish is now fulfilled in the above work, which is hailed in Germany as a very valuable contribution to the history of the Roman Church in the Middle Ages.

A historical and statistical account of the Lutheran Church of Russia, by the Rev. F. Hunnius, (*Die evangelische Lutherische Kirche Russlands*, Leipsic, 1877,) is a little work of great interest for the Protestant world. The Lutheran Church of Russia is numerically stronger than is generally known. According to Hunnius the population connected with it numbers 4,024,035. The Church embraces nearly the whole population of Finland and the three Baltic provinces, and has given to Russia many of its ablest statesmen. The work contains also a brief statement of the other Protestant Churches of Russia, the Reformed, United Evangelical, the Scotch Presbyterian, the Wurtemberg Pietists, and the Mennonites.

A Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. P. Scholz, has published a work on idolatry and witchcraft among the Hebrews and the neighboring nations, (*Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebräern, Regensburg*, 1877.) Though deficient in its first part, which treats of idolatry in gen-

eral, and of witchcraft, it is recommended by the theological journals of Germany for the abundance of material which it has collated from the ecclesiastical and secular writers, and from Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian sources.

## DENMARK.

The Lutheran Church of Denmark has had since 1871 a theological Quarterly Review, which is entitled *Theologisk Tidskrift*, and is edited by Dr. Charles H. Kalkar. The editor was formerly pastor of a Lutheran congregation, but has during the last seven years devoted himself entirely to the publication of this theological Review and to other literary work. He is known in the theological world by an able work on Roman Catholic missions, and other publications relating to Church history. His Review was at first intended to fill a gap which had been caused a few years before by the discontinuance of a theological journal published by Professor Scharling, and containing little more than notices of new books. Dr. Kalkar's new review aimed from the start at a wider compass. It was to bring essays from every department of theology, reports on the present condition of the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic Churches, and discussions of all questions relating to the Church of Denmark. The seven volumes of the theological articles which have thus far appeared contain contributions from a number of distinguished theologians. A translation of the titles of the articles contained in the volume of 1877 will give some idea of its contents: Rindom, The Doctrine of the Irvingites, especially in Denmark; P. Trogel and Bishop Brammes, The Use of the Word "Friend" in the New Testament; Fich, The Historical Reality of the Resurrection of Christ, (with special references to an exegetical work by Bang, published in Christiana;) Madsen, On the Reading of the Bible; P. Kofoed-Hansen, On the Idea of an Everlasting Unhappiness; Dr. Kalkar, Pulpit and Politics; Koch, Memoir of Professor Clausen; Hasle, State, People's, and Free Churches; Dr. Kalkar, Börresen and the Danish Mission; H. V., The Origin of the Fourth Gospel—arguing, chiefly from inner reasons, that it was not written by the Apostle John, but by a highly educated contemporary, who was a native of Asia Minor and a resident of Jerusalem; Bohn, The Evangelical Movement in Italy, especially in Rome; Condition of the German Universities in the Fourth Decennium of the Present Century.

## ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*Essentials and Non-Essentials in Religion.* Six Lectures delivered in Music Hall, Boston. By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE, Author of "Orthodoxy: Its Truths and Errors;" "Steps of Belief," "Ten Great Religions," "Christian Doctrine of Prayer," "Common Sense in Religion," etc. 16mo., pp. 148. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1878.

These Lectures receive this permanent form for several reasons, as the publishers inform us, but "especially" because of "the warm approval expressed by persons of other denominations" than the Unitarian. Dr. Clarke does not here for the first time discuss the topics presented. A gentleman of high scholarly culture, an author of acknowledged ability, an eminent minister in his denomination, with hosts of personal friends and admirers, on whatever subject he writes or speaks he commands a generous and respectful attention. Possessed with an ardent desire to break down the barriers or bridge the chasm between orthodoxy and liberalism, he has labored diligently to find or to create some common ground where both may meet in the "communion of saints." Such is the endeavor of the present volume. Its title asserts that there are "essentials" in the faith of the Christian Church, and Dr. Clarke undertakes their disclosure, with an apparently entire forgetfulness that Protestant Christendom has for a generation had its opinions pretty well settled on the whole subject. And, of course, notwithstanding his often emphasized dogma that "Christianity is a life," whoever rejects any one of those essentials cannot be a good Christian, however good a Jew, or Buddhist, or Mohammedan, or Pagan, he may be.

Evangelical Christians of every name and land agree in holding certain truths, which they regard as essential to the Christian system, such as the divine inspiration and authority of the holy Scriptures, the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, his incarnation and vicarious atonement, his mediatorial intercession and reign, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, justification by faith alone in Christ as the only Saviour, and supernatural regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Take them away, and what is left is, in their judgment, not Christianity. Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, no more doubt them than they do the sun's rising in the east; and they cannot, without imminent peril to spiritual religion, place any one of them in the category of non-essentials, with theories and philosophies which attempt their

adjustment in a theological system. Acceptance of Dr. Clarke's Essentials requires the rejection of nearly every truth deemed by evangelical Christians necessary and fundamental. We note a few: Jesus, he teaches, was "Son of God, and divine—because filled full of the divine truth and love;" and he denies his "deity of person." "Christ's death did not make it possible for God to pardon sinners." "Saving faith in Jesus Christ is to believe as he believed, trust in God as he trusted, hope as he hoped, and love as he loved;" and this is his exposition of "faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." "We deny that the belief of any proposition is essential to human salvation;" and, as though John Wesley held the same position, he is quoted as saying that "a string of opinions is no more Christian faith than a string of beads is Christian practice." Mr. Wesley is also adduced as a remarkable illustration of the faith above described; but his own statement is as unlike it as is a circle unlike a straight line. He says of himself that he "did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation," and he defined faith as "a full reliance on the blood of Christ—a trust in the merits of his life, death, and resurrection —a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for us and living in us." Dr. Clarke agrees with Mr. Wesley in what Christian faith is *not:* will he also accept his statement of what Christian faith *is?* These references are enough. To stand upon Dr. Clarke's platform we must believe the Bible not divinely inspired or of divine authority, refuse honor to the eternal Son of God, and deny the Lord that bought us.

One hardly knows which to admire more, the magnificent bravery or the calm, innocent simplicity that, from the Music Hall platform, summons Christendom with such cool confidence to renounce its belief in what it holds essential and necessary, for the high privilege of brotherhood with those who reject the faith of all the ages. Great compassion is due those "persons of other denominations" whose "warm approval" is given to their being told that their "Christianity consists essentially in being converted, not in leading an upright life," and that if a sinner asks what he must do to be saved, "no one can exactly say what is to be done." Many of Dr. Clarke's representations of the orthodox faith are the merest caricatures, as he assuredly should know; and no amount of brilliant rhetoric can excuse them. He exercises a great facility in using the well-known language and terms of orthodoxy, whose meaning has been settled and

uniform for ages, in a sense of his own, so that many things that he says convey entirely different ideas to different persons. However useful this may be to a politician seeking partisan success, or to a lawyer laboring to confuse a jury, it is not the usage of men desirous of exactness in speech, or of imparting exact ideas.

---

*Faith and Philosophy.* Discourses and Essays by HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., LL.D. Edited, with an Introductory Notice, by GEORGE L. PRENTISS, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, in the City of New York. 8vo., pp. 496. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1877.

Henry B. Smith was born in 1815, and died in 1877. He was a native of Portland, Maine; was a graduate of Bowdoin, in a class marked for talent, and studied theology at Bangor and at Andover. Thence he went to Germany and studied at Halle and Berlin. He was the valued pupil of Neander, Tholuck, and Ulrici. Under these eminent teachers he prosecuted with enthusiasm the study of Church history, theology, and philosophy. On his return he spent five happy years in the pastorate, and then filled successive professorships at Andover, Amherst, and New York. In New York he established the Presbyterian Review, which afterward became The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review. The volume before us is a noble monument of his life and labors. The introduction, including a brief biography by his fellow-professor, is a warm-hearted tribute to his high personal qualities, as well as an appreciative survey of his works. As his career was noble, and his position pre-eminent, so his productions are held as standards.

Of the pieces here presented, six are discussions of theological topics, and six are adverse reviews. The first, on Faith and Philosophy, which gives title to the book, is his master-piece in direct discussion. His reviews handle the English rationalists, Sir William Hamilton, Professor Draper, Whedon on the Will, Renan, and Strauss. Hereby the Editor of this Quarterly finds himself in highly respectable, but, with the exception of Sir William, decidedly unacceptable, company.

The review of "Whedon on the Will" was one of several replies to that work, some four or five, we believe, published in the Calvinistic Quarterlies soon after its publication. We then pronounced it, and still think it, the ablest of them all, without saying to how much of a compliment that amounted. It was the only one to which we thought proper to offer any reply, which we did in our Quarterly, to the extent, if we rightly recol-

lect, of some fifteen fine-print pages. It is the only one, we believe, that has attained the honor of a re-publication. It is the only one which, so far as we know, was claimed by its friends to be a successful refutation. This we esteem a one-sided claim. It never entered our head to imagine that the reply was in any degree an *answer* to the book reviewed. On the contrary, in our reply we stated that we considered that the article was simply a re-statement of overthrown positions, overthrown in the book itself. Nearly every argument of the review could be completely answered simply by a quotation from the work reviewed. We said that his article was thus "refuted before it was written, like an infant reprobate damned before it was born." We should have added a second article, but were deterred by the conviction that those who read Dr. Smith's article would not read ours, and *vice versa*. We were like two advocates pleading the same case before different juries: each would win a victory more easy than profitable in his own court. The article itself is a dogged defense of the clock-hammer human freedom, according to which the will chooses as the hammer strikes, with no power otherwise, and men are damned for choosing the only way they could choose. As an answer, it is failure in the whole, and failure upon every point, with, perhaps, a single exception. We could have easily shown this in a second or third article. But there is another and perhaps better way to answer it, if answer were needed. Those who have read our volume know that we have therein given full quotations from the ablest necessitarians that have ever written, Hobbes and the Edwardses, classified and assigned them their proper place, and then furnished to each the refutation. Did stereotype permit us to publish an enlarged edition of our work, we could take Dr. Smith's article and cut it in slices, and assign each quoted slice its proper place in addition to its predecessors, and the same logical mill that crushed them would dispose of him. We should seldom need more than a sentence or two to show that our Reviewer was answered before he wrote. But we doubt not that our ascended brother, in the higher and purer atmosphere to which he has been translated, sees these things more clearly than either of us could see them in this our present terrene twilight.

---

*Substitution:* A Treatise on the Atonement. By MARSHALL RANDLES. 8vo., pp. 255. London: J. Grose Thomas & Co.

This is both an able and timely production. The subject is, indeed, an old one in the arena of theological conflict, and many-

sided as well, and the controversy on the nature of the atonement is very far from being ended. In some of its phases, perhaps, nothing can be added to what former writers have said; but recent authors, as Robertson, Maurice, Jowett, Young, Bushnell, and Dale, have brought so prominently before the public mind theories adverse to the doctrine of the substitution of Christ in his sufferings and death for man, that a careful re-statement of the doctrine has become highly desirable. This task Mr. Randles has attempted, with the purpose of supplementing, rather than superseding, previous works. Nevertheless, making the element of substitution his central point, he so far traverses the entire field that his volume must be regarded as the most important publication of recent years on the subject of the atonement. He rests, as might be expected, on the Scriptures as his one sure foundation, rather than the philosophy upon which opponents to his view so resolutely plant themselves; but he also holds and shows that a true philosophy accords with and upholds the doctrine advanced.

After an introductory chapter on the "Rationale of the Atonement," Mr. Randles clears his way by a series of discriminating "Definitions and Distinctions," in which atonement, substitution, satisfaction, propitiation, and expiation appear, with the sense indicated in which the terms are used. This chapter alone is worth the cost of the volume, because of the clearness and scientific precision of its contents, thus preventing difficulty at the outset, and avoiding confusion in the future. Then in successive chapters is considered Substitution as implied in Christ our Sacrifice, our Ransom, and our Representative, with a full examination of the different passages of Scripture involved. All along he finds the doctrine of vicariousness, of transfer of guilt and punishment, that is, of obligation to suffer the penal effects of sin and the actually suffering them. That moral character is transferable he constantly denies. One of the most valuable portions of the book is in its treatment of the relation of substitution to the claims of justice, the problem being thus stated: "Given: man in such a condition, (having disobeyed the law, and exposed himself to the consequences thereof,) under such a government, (perfect in justice as in every thing else,) and such a disposition on the part of the Governor to spare and restore him: how, in our conception, and according to our available knowledge, was it possible for God to effect the benevolent end?" It is the question of every thoughtful human soul as well as of the theologian; and

Mr. Randles' plain and discriminating answer to it is, that "God can and does forgive sin on the ground created by the vicarious sufferings of the Divine-Human Christ; but on such conditions as consist with the free agency of man." The scriptural, logical, and beautiful elucidation of this answer is as effective as it is complete. The harmony of this doctrine with that of Reconciliation, and its relation to Sanctification, are next considered, following which are discussed the theories of pardon on prerogative and on repentance, and the moral-power theory, as taught by Young, Bushnell, and others.

Mr. Randles holds, as we think, the true and only tenable ground. We are able only to present his volume in brief outline, which we do with the special commendation of it to our readers as fairly and ably abreast with the present state of the controversy.

---

*Eternal Hope.* Five Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey, November and December, 1877. By the Rev. FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, etc. 12mo., pp. lviii, 225. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1878.

The most surprising thing connected with these sermons, even more than their delivery, is that Canon Farrar should "*unexpectedly* find himself entangled in a controversy" over them. So strange a misreckoning of British religious opinion as to suppose that their bold, outspoken heterodoxy proclaimed in Westminster Abbey would awaken no antagonism, save, perhaps, in the gentlest criticism, is not easily accounted for. Their titles are "What Heaven Is;" "Is Life Worth Living?" "'Hell'—What it is Not;" "Are there Few that be Saved?" and "Earthly and Future Consequences of Sin." They have elegant rhetoric, vigorous declamation, and fervent feeling, but are singularly free from the solid thought and logical argument which an American congregation expects from the average pulpit. Their purpose, except in the first, was to combat "the popular view" of future retribution, namely, according to Dr. Farrar, its material fire and physical tortures, its endless duration, its certainty for the mass of mankind, and its irreversible finality at death. The sermons occupy little more than half the volume. The decision to publish them led to an extended preface, in which the author's views are more fully and elaborately set forth, and, also, to several appendixes bearing more or less directly on the question of continued probation after death. Several of their features are discussed in our Synopsis of the Quarterlies.

How widely the opinion prevails that hell is a place of physical torment we do not know. The Scriptures do employ such weighty expressions as these: "Outer darkness," the "place of torment," "everlasting fire," "the furnace of fire," "the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth." None of these is taken from the book of Revelation. Now, whether they should be interpreted literally or figuratively, who shall say? If the former, they are terrible enough without the least addition by medieval painter or modern preacher, if addition be even possible. If the latter, they are no less terrible, for types and figures only shadow forth the reality, and the mental woe suggested by such a word as "fire" must be indescribable. It should be observed, moreover, that these expressions are found in plain prose, where we do not commonly look for poetic figures; but in no case can any reasonable interpretation take from them their fearful significance.

Dr. Farrar protests with some vehemence, over and again, against dependence on texts and passages accepted as teaching the endlessness of future retribution, to the neglect of the whole scope and tenor of the Scriptures, and the known character of God. It might be said that that scope and tenor must be gathered from the body of texts and passages which make up the Bible, and it is certainly wrong to wrench any text from its meaning in its connection. Now, the tenor of Scripture is that God in infinite love has provided a remedy for sin, which, with intense earnestness, he urges upon sinners, telling them most plainly that only by it have they possible hope of salvation. With this as its scope, no reliance on special texts is needed to learn that hurt must follow rejection of Christ, while they may and do show the measureless magnitude of that hurt. Yet he falls into the very error which he declaims against. Besides collecting half a dozen pages of texts, including "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," to show that hell is not endless, he is compelled by the force of "one or two passages" to declare that he is "unable to adopt the Universalist opinion;" and in one of the four places where he repudiates it he assigns as a reason that "it is impossible for us to estimate the hardening effect of obstinate persistence in evil, and the power of the human will to resist the law and love of God." If the notion of material "fire" were eliminated from the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, what might be left would quite fairly exhibit Dr. Farrar's position, though he would *call* it by some other name.

*Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

*Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With Tunes.* New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

These welcome volumes, advance copies of which have been handed us, will shortly be in the possession of our readers. As the work of an able and efficient Committee appointed by the Bishops of the Church, under authority of the General Conference, they rightfully come to us with weighty promise; and they will, we doubt not, equal the high anticipations of the Church. It was a happy thought that placed the preparation of the two books in the same hands, and another that made their publication simultaneous, thus wedding for a generation to come certain hymns with certain tunes, and contributing to the firmer welding of our people into a harmonious whole by their common hymnic liturgy, in which East, West, North, and South unite and agree.

We observe at the outset a different and more scientific classification and arrangement than even that excellent one with which we have been familiar, with its chief topics as follows: "Worship," "God," "Christ," "Holy Spirit," "The Scriptures," "The Sinner," "The Christian," "The Church," "Time and Eternity," "Miscellaneous." They have their appropriate sub-topics, with a careful and somewhat rigidly accurate distribution of the hymns under them; and the hymns are arranged in the same numerical order in both books.

Of the hymns in this collection, most will endure the test of the severest criticism. There are many noble poems that have none of the elements of the hymn, and from these the new Hymn Book is singularly free. A true hymn must be exalted in theme, elevated in expression, poetic, religious, spiritual, and full of feeling. These characteristics have ever in an eminent degree belonged to the hymnology of our Methodism. It was fortunate in having for its chief lyrist Charles Wesley, than whom the modern Church has produced no sweeter singer. His hymns, of course, form the basis of the new book, as they did of the former collections, and do of all Methodist hymn books; and it contains all the best he ever wrote. About three hundred and eighty hymns of the old book are omitted, leaving, it may be readily believed, as a residuum, most of the previous accumulations of lyric poetry that is really worth retaining. Some of it may never be sung, nor do we think that to be the true test or only use of a hymn. Read in the parlor, or in the closet, it may waft the soul as near to heaven as if it rose on the wings of song. There is a

"making melody in your hearts" that is sweeter than the vocal singer can produce.

In the three hundred and seventy new hymns, making a total of eleven hundred and seventeen, exclusive of doxologies, there is sufficient variety to satisfy all tastes and all proper demands. Out of the vast amount of material that has been produced in the last thirty years, by translations from the hymns of the Latin, Greek, and German, and by modern authors, our Committee, though embarrassed by their riches, have made an excellent selection, doubtless as good as any similar Committee could be expected to make. Certain it is that severe care, diligent labor, and conscientious effort have been employed in the work, and the result is a volume with which the Church has great reason to be more than content. We believe that the more carefully both books are examined, the greater will be the satisfaction with them.

And now it is very desirable that the Hymnal be made, so far as possible, the one book for use in all the services of the Church, the Sabbath-school, and the social meeting, as well as the sanctuary. The hymns of the Church should be reckoned among the educating agencies of her children, and their young voices should be trained for use in the congregation; and no better hymns for the prayer and class-rooms need be desired than are some hundreds of this collection. By this rule we shall fulfill the psalmist's petition, "Let all the people praise thee."

---

*The Early Years of Christianity: Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church.* By E. De Pressensé, D.D., author of "Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work." Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. 12mo., pp. xxiv, 528. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

The three previous volumes of Dr. Pressensé's noble work, entitled respectively, "The Apostolic Era," "Martyrs and Apologists," "Heresy and Christian Doctrine," left a fourth topic, namely, "Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church," for the present volume. It is written in the same brilliant and vigorous style, with the same profound conviction of the need in our century of the spiritual Christianity of the apostolic age, and the same power of sharp discrimination that threw such an enchanting interest upon their pages. It is in three Books, treating, first, of "Ecclesiastical Life in the Second and Third Centuries," second, of "Private and Public Worship" in the same period, and, third, of "The Moral Life of Christians in the Third and Fourth Centuries."

The organization of the Church at the beginning of the second century is described, with the location of authority, the methods of discipline, and the mutual relation of the Churches. The rise of the hierarchy and the successive steps of the increase of episcopal authority distinctly appear, and the "crisis" at Alexandria, Rome, and Carthage, is fairly shown. But the primacy of Rome is not dreamed of at the close of the third century.

The subject of Christian worship receives admirable and instructive treatment. Its primitive simplicity and spirituality slowly give place to changes which modify its character. The religion and worship of the home, the days set apart for worship, the erection of special edifices for the purpose, the forms employed, and the prayers, hymns, and preaching, with the changes introduced in them, are the subjects of half a dozen most interesting chapters. In the third Book Christianity appears as a moral reformer, first, in the family, and then in the social life and institutions of the empire. The Pagan and Christian family are put in sharp contrast. Christianity, in its relation to the home, to slavery, to the State, to the theater, and to art, is discussed in five chapters, and the book concludes with a fine chapter on "The Christianity of the Catacombs."

In reading the volume we clearly and painfully discern the gradual transformation of the character of the Church in its progress toward the sacerdotalism and centralization which a little later became so powerful, and later still developed in the system of the Romish hierarchy. We feel assured that our readers will find a great pleasure as well as profit in its perusal; and we commend the whole series as worthy a place in every library.

---

*Homiletical Index.* A Hand-Book of Texts, Themes, and Authors, for the Use of Preachers and Bible Scholars Generally. Embracing Twenty Thousand Citations of Scripture Texts, and Discourses Founded Thereon. By J. H. PETTINGELL, A.M. With an Introduction, by GEORGE E. DAY, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale College. 8vo., pp. 316. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

This book simply grew. The Rev. Mr. Pettingell, early in his ministry, found desirable an index to whatever his library contained touching any passage of Scripture, and, as many others who have felt the same want have omitted to do, he made his notes of reference in the margin of his study-Bible. This process, continued for a series of years, furnished much of the material for the present volume. The work is unique in design and admirable in plan. Part I. is a "Textual Index," arranged in triple columns, the first presenting all the principal texts of Scripture in their

proper order, from Genesis to Revelation; the second citing the themes of discourse which eminent preachers have based upon the texts quoted, with the reference to the proper volume; and the third giving the names of the authors. The intention has been to exclude both sermons that are ephemeral in their character, and those that are not easy to be found. Some twenty thousand citations are thus made. Part II is a "Topical Index," the reverse of the former. It contains an alphabetical list of the themes and topics of the Textual Index, with the corresponding texts and names of more than a thousand authors. The excellence and helpfulness of this work to ministers and biblical students are obvious, especially as a key to their own libraries or the public theological libraries to which they may have access, enabling an easy reference, with no loss of time in the search. To a preacher it is pleasant, and often profitable, to know what various topics may be found in the same text; and he may sometimes obtain a suggestion of subjects for his own use. Four Appendixes, containing various tabular and textual arrangements, with other useful matter, give additional value to the work. The labor of its preparation has not been small, but it cannot fail to be of great convenience and utility. The Introduction, of half a dozen pages, by Dr. Day, is well worth reading and remembering, especially by every young minister who would derive the most help from the sermons of others, and at the same time maintain his own independence and self-respect.

---

*The Levitical Priests.* A Contribution to the Pentateuch. By SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, Jun., Doctor of Philosophy, Leipzig. With a Preface by Prof. FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D. 12mo., pp. xxix, 254. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. New York: Scribner, Welford, and Armstrong. 1877. Price, $2 50.

Mr. Curtiss, an American scholar resident in Germany, who has won in Europe an enviable reputation for his scientific spirit and thorough learning, ably reviews in this volume the latest phase of Pentateuch criticism, which maintains that the elevation of the sons of Aaron to the priesthood, depriving their brethren, the Levites, of the equality with them which they had previously enjoyed, was the work of Ezekiel; from which it follows that the book of Deuteronomy was written after the exile, perhaps by Hilkiah, and foisted upon Moses. Mr Curtiss takes up the arguments adduced in favor of this theory, and by a careful examination shows the existence of the distinction between priests and Levites not only in the time of Ezra, but in all periods of the Israelitish history, and that Deuteronomy, while it abridges, does

in no wise contradict the preceding legislation. He shows that while the prophets directed their shafts at the idolatrous and wicked priests, there was between them and the priesthood, as such, no antagonism. As to the authorship of Deuteronomy, Mr. Curtiss sees nothing requiring its ascription to Hilkiah, and, while not denying the critical difficulties in the way of crediting it to Moses, finds much greater ones in the way of assigning it to any other. He next turns to the theory that Ezra wrote the middle books of the Pentateuch, and arrays a conclusive argument against it, and holds that such criticism makes the Bible a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, and "no longer God's revelation to man." We have thus outlined the main features of this work, leaving it to our readers to test for themselves its excellence in thought and scholarship, and its lofty and devout spirit as well.

---

*The Religious Feeling.* A Study for Faith. By NEWMAN SMYTH. 12mo., pp. 171. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1877.

This is a small book, but we are aware of no other in the English language that so thoroughly treats its great subject. It simply assumes that we know the external world by touching it, and then puts forward as the chief religious question of our day, that relating to our capacity to come to a knowledge of God, if indeed there is a God. "Can he *touch* us, and we *feel* him?" On interrogating consciousness, the universal feeling of absolute dependence appears, which is the religious feeling in its simplest and earliest form, and is inseparable from our sense of personal existence. With this is the feeling of moral dependence, of obligation and responsibility, from which we cannot free ourselves. The derivative theory of the moral sense fails to meet all the facts. The next step in the discussion is to show that the religious feeling involves a religious perception. The transition from the feeling of dependence is found in the phenomena of wonder, fear, and awe, the beginnings of the idea of God, "the undefined revelation of the Infinite One;" and intuitions, like that of cause, the unconditioned, and the infinite, proceeding from the sense of dependence, furnish us a real knowledge. Moral reality impresses itself upon the soul, and from it springs the sense of moral obligation, which rests ultimately in God, as the one perfect Being, who is Law-giver and Judge. The concluding chapter notes, first, certain objections which may be urged against the views thus presented, and then the work which the logical understanding must perform in perfecting a correct and

full theology. The drift of many thoughtful minds is in the direction taken in this essay, which will well repay a perusal, even though the reader fail to accord with all its positions.

---

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of Matthew.* By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D., Oberconsistorialrath, Hanover. Translated from the Sixth Edition of the German by Rev. PETER CHRISTIE. The Translation Revised and Edited by FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. xliii, 451. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877. Price, $3.

*Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Acts of the Apostles.* By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Rev. PATON J. GLOAG, D.D. The Translation Revised and Edited by WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Vol. II., 8vo., pp. 325. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1877. Price, $3.

These volumes are the ninth and tenth of the series as issued by Messrs. Clark. The translations are made by amply competent hands from the latest German editions. Dr. Meyer had just before his death, in 1873, completed the revision of Matthew in preparation for the sixth edition, and with no material change it is given to us as he left it. This first volume on Matthew extends to the end of the seventeenth chapter, with an Introduction to the Gospel of forty-four pages, and a biographical sketch of Dr. Meyer by his son. The volume on the Acts commences with the thirteenth chapter, and includes the remainder of Luke's narrative. Our high estimate of Dr. Meyer's Commentary has been heretofore so freely expressed that we need only say that the exegetical student who secures its volumes as they are issued makes most valuable additions to his apparatus for critical study of the New Testament.

---

*The People's Commentary:* Including Brief Notes on the New Testament, with Copious References to Parallel and Illustrative Scripture Passages, designed to Aid Bible Students and Common Readers to Understand the Meaning of the Inspired Word. By AMOS BINNEY, author of "The Theological Compend." With an Introduction by DANIEL STEELE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 706. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

This complete Commentary on the entire New Testament in a single duodecimo volume cannot fail to be of great convenience and utility to many persons, especially those whose means will not allow the purchase of a more extended work. Mr. Binney, its author, is one of the fathers of the New England Conference, and has been known to two generations in the Church by his admirable "Theological Compend." With little attempt at original investigation, he has gathered the results of the study of the best

commentators, and put them, with his own labor of nearly twenty years, into brief, condensed, yet very clear notes, which common readers will seldom fail to understand. The proposed limits of the work exclude most of the elaboration and explanation that are often necessary, yet no difficult passage is overlooked, and a vast amount of the best interpretation is brought within reach of the million. Many of the annotations consist simply of collections of pertinent Scripture references, making the Bible to some extent its own expositor. The full Scripture text is given at the top of the page, but in smaller type, thus allowing a much larger amount of matter to be furnished.

The Introduction, by Dr. Steele, Mr. Binney's son-in-law, shows that, in examining the entire work, both in manuscript and proof-sheets, he has freely lent it the aid of his critical skill and thorough scholarship, and no doubt the many months of severe labor thus bestowed have contributed to its greater excellence and wider acceptability. We heartily wish the book an extended circulation.

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science.* By J. W. DAWSON, LL.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of M'Gill University, Montreal. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

Though written upon the basis of Archaia, published in 1860, and favorably noticed in our Quarterly, this is essentially a new book from Dr. Dawson's pen. It maintains, with remarkable consistency, the same general views as the former volume, brought down to the latest conditions of science. It consists of a general and thorough comparative survey, through twelve chapters, of the Mosaic cosmogony and the creational teachings of science, with three chapters on the Antiquity of Man, and an Appendix of fifty-one pages, embracing eleven sections on as many scientific topics relating to creational history. These sections contain many valuable suggestions in regard to the present phases of science and biblical interpretation. The high position of Dr. Dawson in the scientific world will command respect for his utterances; and his equal mastery of biblical lore and physical science eminently qualifies him for the work he here undertakes.

Availing himself of the late Assyrian discoveries, Dr. Dawson assumes, as we have suggested in our Quarterly, that there is an "Abrahamic Genesis;" that is, that the cosmogonic chapters of

the Bible were truly brought by Abraham from Chaldea, being the Shemite account of creation, of which the clay tablets furnish a corrupted variation. In interpreting the cosmogony, Dr. Dawson assumes the truth of the nebular theory, and the æonic length of the Mosaic "day," and finds a coincidence between Moses and geology, which furnishes powerful proof of the inspiration of the record. His views since the first publication of Archaia have so little changed that the tabular page, in which the correspondence between the Mosaic and scientific cosmogony is synoptically exhibited in the former volume, remains unchanged in this. What we said of the former volume we reiterate in regard to this, that it furnishes on the whole the clearest harmony between the two records within our knowledge.

The divine "rest" at the close of the great week consists in the fact that, as Dr. Dawson holds, no new species has been created since that close. Varieties have emerged in great plenty and complexity, but there has been no specific origination. And hence, we may note, arises the refusal of science to acknowledge creation of species at all; no creation has taken place during the age of science, and so the human conception is puzzled to frame in thought a process which experience has never beheld. And so Mr. Huxley tells us that science can know nothing but generative production; and what science does not know, he leaves us to infer, is not to be held true.

But there are worlds of truth that science, as science, cannot know. History, and especially revealed history, science knows not; though the scientist does. Revealed history is none the less true because it is not included in the domain of science. The scientist does not reject the truth of the death of Cesar by assassination because it is not science. When, therefore, the scientist tells us that science knows no creation, our reply is: But history knows it, and knew it before science was born.

On the "unity and antiquity of man" Dr. Dawson is decisive. He holds the deluge to have covered but a part of western Asia, and that the Caspian Sea probably is the receptacle of its drainage; but the entire human race was destroyed, and all existing men are descendants of Noah, in accordance with biblical chronology. The earliest cave men of western Europe, as found by science, were, probably, antediluvian; but that race disappeared. Following such authorities as Max Müller, Latham, and Edkins, supplemented by researches of his own, he believes that the languages of the various races of the earth exhibit reliable traces of original identity.

The proofs of original linguistic unity we still imagine to be precarious. If we hold the geologic man which Professor Marsh thinks he has unearthed in America to be absolutely real, (though we wait for further evidence before doing so,) we may conclude either that the deluge destroyed not the entire human race, or, still farther back, we may, with M'Causland and Reginald Poole, accept the pre-adamic man.

And, *first*, what necessity for holding the diluvian destruction of the entire race in all parts of the earth? If we limit the terms of the sacred narrative to a specialty in regard to the surface covered, we can just as well limit the terms, no less universal, in regard to the population destroyed, to a specialty. The terms in the sacred record regarding *animals* destroyed seem equally as universal, but they are limited by Dr. Dawson to that *one center of creation*, the Edenic, the Adamic. Now, is it probable that for near sixteen hundred years the daring antediluvian men never left that center, never peopled eastern Asia, nor Africa, nor ever crossed Behring's Straits? If so, how could the African, or American, or eastern Asiatic, have been affected by the deluge? Dr. Dawson admits that the cave men of western Europe may have been antediluvians; how, then, were they drowned by a flood around the Caspian Sea and the Euphrates valley? Why not admit, if the facts are thereby easily solved, that the Chinaman, the Lapp, the American Indian, the Negro, or all, are Adamites, but not Noachidæ? All these have been, with doubtful propriety, classed as Turanian. And the admission that the Turanians are antediluvian, or rather non-diluvian, is, we think, very easy, if necessary. The flood may as reasonably be limited to that "center" in regard to people destroyed as in regard to territory.

And, *second*, why not accept, if need be, the pre-adamic man? If Dr. Dawson admits an Adamic center of creation, why not admit, if pressed, other centers of human origin? The record does not seem to deny other centers in narrating the history of this center. The atonement, as all evangelical theology admits, has a retrospective power. It provides, as St. Paul says, "remission for the sins that are past;" that is, for those who lived and sinned before Christ died; and who received "remission" from God in anticipation of the atonement. It was thus that Abraham was justified by faith, through the Christ that had not yet made the expiation. The atonement thus may throw responsibility and propitiation for sin over all past time, all terrene sections, and all human races. So, too, the sin of Adam may

bring all past misdoings of earlier races under the category of sin and condemnation; that is, under the inauguration of a system of retribution which otherwise would not have taken existence. • Some theologians have held that the atonement throws its sublime influence over other worlds than ours; why not, then, over earlier human races? Here, as often elsewhere, science, that seemed to threaten theology, does but open before it broader fields and sublimer elevations. It contradicts our narrow interpretations, and reads into the text worlds of new meaning. With this provisional view we have not the slightest misgiving as to the effect of the demonstration of the pre-adamic man upon our own theology.

Dr. Dawson shows no sign of yielding to the latest logic of Darwinism. Before the divine "rest" species were created. And the superstitious horror expressed by many scientists at what they effeminately style "*special* creation" he soothes by telling them that creation is by law; that is, it accords with the law of divine wisdom, which acts with a free uniformity in similar conditions. It is simply the continued action of that same orderly power which originated existence at first. The whole drift of geological evidence, as pictured on the ancient strata, declares that species have ever sprung, by divine law, power, and act, into sudden and complete existence. All this is not contravened by the fact that as viewed by the investigation the lines of descending species become wonderfully and even inextricably entangled. And at this point we may suggest that Darwinists cover all difficulties by impeaching the sufficiency of the geological record; just as if they were sure that the complete record would prove genetic evolution. How do they know that the complete record, perfectly understood, would not, after all, show that, while varieties were far more numerous than we suspected, yet true species have nevertheless suddenly originated, and drawn their long and spreading lines through the ages.

On this whole subject we offer the following suggestions:—

1. To an observant human spectator, a positive creation of a new form would appear to be what is at the present day called, not very properly, "spontaneous generation." To his bodily eye the divine Creator would be invisible. And could he see the particles and parts so take their place as to form a symmetrical being of full size, the whole process would appear to be a spontaneity. In this sense "spontaneous generation," that is, *creation*, we may believe to be a truth.

2. But experimentists will never find it in the direction of animalcular spontaneous production. Neither the condition of such spontaneity, nor the result, can be effected by human agency. Biblically, we may believe that, even by divine power, such creative spontaneity or creation was limited within the period of the creative week, and was then exerted in producing large and complete as well as minute forms. It could take place only in those conditions and at those stages of existence required by the divine plan; which is no other than the plan of nature; for the plan and laws of nature are only the permanent ordering and proceeding of the divine volitions. At the proper stage of progression the divine will works under guise of the formative energy, or, as Cudworth more beautifully styled it, "the plastic power." This plastic power may construct an entirely new form; or it may complete, with new addition, an old form; or it may, by successive originating plasms, carry on a series of perfecting forms through successive epochs. This plastic power may work through ordinary generation to vary or perfect an existing form or species, or may originate at successive epochs. The phenomena of geology indicate that new species have thus suddenly come into existence.

3. The case of the horse was adduced by Professor Huxley, to prove that *all* animal forms and species are produced by generative development. He did make probable that the equine plan is geologically very ancient, and that it has gone through a series of such epochal perfectings. Whether these epochal perfectings were by generative modifications or creative plasms, he did not show. And even assuming that the equine plan was perfected through successive generations, he proved nothing beyond the equine form. He did not thereby prove that man became man by generation from a lower species.

4. But it may be said science knows new forms to originate by generation, but knows no creation. To which we reply: 1, That science knows no creation, because creation ceased before science began; and, 2, That science cannot disprove the statement by revelation that creations have taken place, and we have a right to trust revelation until science disproves it. The ignorance of science cannot refute a revealed fact.

5. In our Quarterly for October, 1877, page 750, we gave Dr. Winchell's brief notes of his reasons for his present conviction, that genetic evolution should be accepted. Without impeaching his science or his orthodoxy, we must say that the reasons do not

convey full conviction to our own mind. His reasons may be summarized as one. The latest researches show that a large proportion of animals heretofore recognized as species are found to be only varieties. In other words, investigation and exploration, as they progress, reveal not only vast numbers of animals hitherto unknown, but a vast number of relations between animals hitherto unsuspected. So we should expect. Let our noble army of scientists prosecute their researches and find next, if they can, the extent and limit of the animal forms, and also the extent and limit of the relations between them. Let them not in hasty zeal, or in hasty fright, jump to unascertained conclusions, and cry out that there are no limits. Genetic relations may, perhaps, be immensely numerous and complicated, and yet a permanent number of real creations of species still remain. If Dr. Dawson is right in maintaining, down to the year 1877, that the whole drift of geology affirms sudden appearance of species during the creative week, there is a solid standing ground, we imagine, against the illimitability of genetic relations.

---

*The Ancient Life-History of the Earth.* A Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palæontological Science. By H. ALLEYNE NICHOLSON, M.D., D. Sc., F.R.S.E., F.L.S., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews. 12mo., pp. xviii, 407. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

In a former work Professor Nicholson considered the facts of Palæontology on its biological side, reserving for the present volume the historical side of the science, and its relations with geology. The work is in two parts, the first being devoted to general principles, and the second taking up the several formations separately and in order, beginning with the Laurentian rocks as the base of the entire stratified series, and considering the relation of each formation to the others, its mode of origin, and its characteristic life-forms, with their chronological succession. Though the work is primarily intended for students, constant reference has been had in its preparation to the wants of the general reader. The author is a thorough master of his subject, and, whether discussing principles, or describing rocks and fossils, writes in a clear and animated style, and with great candor and freedom from dogmatism in the conclusions which he deduces from his facts.

It is clearly ascertained that there has been a succession of life upon the earth in genera, species, sub-kingdoms, and classes, and in the main they succeed one another in time in the relative order

of their zoological rank, the lower groups appearing first, and the higher groups last. All this seems to point to some law of progression, yet Professor Nicholson thinks "we certainly are not yet in a position to formulate this law, or to indicate the precise manner in which it has operated." He discerns some orderly law of modification and evolution; yet it is "certain that there has always been some other deeper and higher law at work," for no theory of evolution can explain "the constant introduction throughout geological time of new forms of life, which do not appear to have been preceded by pre-existent allied types," like the Graptolites and Trilobites. This is as refreshing as it is modest.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Cyprus:* Its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence in that Island. By General Louis Palma Di Cesnola, Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Turin, etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., pp. xix, 456. New York: Harper and Brothers.

The author of this book, an Italian, as his name shows, did the United States some service during the late civil war, and at its close was appointed by President Lincoln, only a few days before his assassination, American Consul at Cyprus. On Christmas day, 1865, he reached the island. As the vessel slowly approached the land, he surveyed the forlorn-looking town of Larnaca, and its unattractive surroundings, and his first thought was to remain on board ship and resign his office. The steamer anchored a mile from the shore, and a small boat from the town brought a score of natives to greet the new consul, who announced themselves as "the staff of the American Consulate." The General and his wife committed themselves to the little craft, and when they reached the beach with no signs of a wharf, the boat stuck in the sand some distance from the dry land, and the representative of the great American Republic was carried ashore on the shoulders of one of the boatmen. But his American wife beheld this proceeding with consternation and horror, and utterly refused to land on Cyprus, or any other island in all the seas, by such a mode of transportation. At last every body else got into the water, and fairly forced the boat over the sand, till the lady was able to step ashore with perfect propriety.

In this ludicrous way the Consul began his acquaintance with his field of official labor, where he was destined to live, and quarrel

with the Turks, and explore old burial-places and ruins, for ten long years. Larnaca occupies the site of ancient Citium; and a mound still exists, which seems to have been the foundation of a temple. Fragments of pottery and antique statuary had been found buried in the earth; and here, the year after his arrival, General Cesnola began to dig in a casual way, little dreaming whereunto his explorations would grow. His hope, as well as his curiosity, was stimulated by the little successes which these first experiments achieved; and soon he was ready to risk all his means, and spend all his time not occupied in the duties of his consulate, in researches which ultimately reached every promising spot in the whole island.

As interesting discoveries began to be made and antique objects of value were dug up, the cupidity of the Turks became excited, and various obstacles were thrown in his way, taxing the firmness and ingenuity, and sometimes rousing the wrath, of the explorer. The English and the French Consuls caught the mania for digging, and were rewarded with some success. Their operations were, however, conducted on a small scale compared with those of Cesnola. He opened thousands of old tombs, Assyrian, Phœnician, Egyptian, and Greek, and discovered immense numbers of interesting objects—statues, vases, coins, gold ornaments, gems, works in alabaster, ivory, silver, bronze and terra-cotta, the relics of various nations, and the highest achievements of their arts, gathered up out of the dust of twenty-five centuries. One single shipment comprised three hundred and sixty cases.

The story of this shipment curiously illustrates the Turkish manner of doing business. General Cesnola had been careful to obtain firmans from the authorities, granting him permission to make his explorations. But when he had made his wonderful discoveries, and gathered his ancient treasures, he was gravely informed that the Government had granted him the privilege of excavating here and there, but had not authorized him to remove from the island any of the objects discovered. As he had borne the entire expense of the work, he regarded as his own the articles which he had found, and he stoutly declared his intention of shipping them for New York. Soon a firman arrived, forbidding the American Consul to take away the relics; and Cesnola sank for a small space into wrathful despair. But one of the natives of his "staff" came to the rescue, reminding him that he, the General, was also Russian Consul; and that, while the firman was sufficiently explicit in regard to the representative of the United

States, it laid no restrictions upon the representative of Russia. The idea was acted upon instantly; the three hundred and sixty cases were hurried on board the vessel waiting for them, and, before the local officials could get a new firman including the Russian Consul, the ship sailed.

The work is well written, beautifully printed, and elegantly illustrated. An introductory chapter gives a brief history of the island, and an Appendix, from the pen of C. W. King, adds ninety pages of antiquarian lore in regard to the gems, inscriptions, and other curious articles discovered.

---

*History of the English People.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M. A. In four volumes. Vol. I—Early England, 449–1071. England Under Foreign Kings, 1071–1204. The Charter, 1204–1291. The Parliament, 1307–1461. With eight maps. 8vo., pp. xii, 576. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Mr. Green's "Short History of the English People," published some four years since, was in every respect so excellent that it not only received wide attention, but won an unusual acceptance among all classes of readers. Its brilliant pages held the student a willing captive, its vivid and varying pictures of English society gave to history an unwonted air of reality, and its evident scholarship was recognized by the learned; while its purpose of a history of the English People, rather than of English kings and conquests, was different from any thing previously attempted, and specially attractive to those who would learn the progress of England by the help of the missionary, the scholar, the printer, and the merchant, to her present constitutional, intellectual, and social condition.

We are familiar with abridgments; but it is seldom that an author pursues the method, as has Mr. Green, of first preparing his compendium, and afterward basing upon it the larger work. In comparing the two, we find some re-arrangements and changes which are for the better. Mr. Green has not hesitated to use the exact language of the "Short History" where, in either accuracy or fullness, it expresses what he would say, but further and broader study and research have made him master of much additional material, of which we have the full benefit. The chapters in Book I., on "Early England," are substantially unchanged, and for the reason, doubtless, that the whole story was already substantially told. English history properly begins with the invasion of Britain in 449 by Hengest and Horsa, for then began the history of Englishmen in that country. Mr. Green shows us their

institutions as they were before the invasion, with their town-moot, hundred-moot, and folk-moot, which were really the foundation of the English domestic, social, and political life of to-day. These they brought with them and planted in their new home, driving out the Briton before them more sweepingly than the Hebrews drove the nations from Canaan. So "a Teutonic society was settled on the wreck of Rome. Not a Briton remained as subject or slave on English ground." Paganism displaced Christianity. Our author dwells not long on the political changes of the times, but he lingers on Augustine and Bede, the conquests of the Cross, and the advance of learning, which have contributed so largely to the molding of English society.

The broader plan of the author leads to a fuller treatment the farther he advances in the volume; but he is ever true to his single purpose of presenting the events of social life out of which has grown the England of to-day. If the work is completed in accordance with the promise of this first volume, of which we make no question, it must take rank with the noblest historical productions of the century. Its style is remarkably clear, vigorous, and fresh, while in power of description Mr. Green is scarcely excelled by Macaulay, Motley, or Stevens. Eight maps are inserted in the volume, showing the political divisions of the country at as many different periods, the usefulness of which is readily apparent.

---

*A History of England in the Eighteenth Century.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. Vols. I, II. 8vo., pp. xix, 626; xvi, 699. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

The period covered by these volumes is a brief one, but it furnishes ample themes for the historian who will dwell less on military events and party incidents than on those facts and institutions which enter deeply into the national life, and become permanent national forces. The author accordingly deals with the great questions and subjects of the century, such as the growth or decline of the different orders of society, of the important interests of the country, agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial, the social, educational and religious movements of the time, and the relations of England to her dependencies and to other nations. The field is a broad one, but it is surveyed with the eye of a master who knows how to bring facts widely scattered in time or place to a single focus. Extensive research, careful collation, and rare philosophic insight are constantly apparent in these

pages, while the easy style of narrative employed is seldom surpassed by a historian.

The author's vision is clear, and his judgments sharp and incisive. The final chapter of a hundred and thirty pages, entitled, "The Religious Revival," is devoted chiefly to the rise and growth of Methodism. As a movement powerfully affecting the condition and welfare of the country, the author gives it the full meed of praise which is now conceded it by all; yet Methodists will not generally assent to some of his sharp delineations of Wesley's personal character. Nevertheless, they, and all readers as well, will find the chapter one of very great interest and power. We presume additional volumes may be expected.

---

*The History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida, from* 1785 *to* 1865. By GEO. G. SMITH, Jun., of North Georgia Conference. 12mo., pp. 530. Macon: John W. Burke & Co. 1877.

Though this volume is written chiefly for the remote South, all Methodist Episcopalians have an interest in the achievements narrated, at least for the first sixty years, for during that period we were one body. The historic names are familiar to us all, and the story of their toils, struggles, and successes is so admirably told that it should receive a wide acceptance. It is in the form of annals, with full personal sketches of men noted in their day, and now gone to their reward. The minuteness of detail has its local importance, but the profuseness of incident cannot fail to interest a wider circle. We note a few slight errors, such as locating Wesleyan University in Vermont, and crediting Dr. Fisk to the same State at his election to the Episcopacy, but we make no question of Mr. Smith's general accuracy. A mistake of more importance is in the following sentence, in the account of the events of 1844: "The famous Committee of Nine, to whom the declaration of the Southern delegates was referred, reported what is known as the Plan of Separation, which provides for the establishment of another General Conference, in case it became evident that such a result was necessary." Mr. Smith, of course, believes this statement beyond question, but if he will examine the document itself, he will find that it simply "provides" for the *action of the Methodist Episcopal Church alone*, "in case" the South should organize a separate Church. As Judah and Ephraim are not going to vex one another any more, it is about time for us all to get this little historical point correct. Yet, the treatment of those times is moderate, candid, and in excellent spirit.

## *Periodicals.*

*The Florida New Yorker.* J. B. OLIVER, Editor. Devoted to the Good Cause of Southern Emigration. Vol. II. Folio, pp. 16 per number. New York: 34 Park Row. 1878.

*The Southern Herald.* Folio, 8 pp. per number. New York, Columbia and Gafney City, S. C.

We place at the head of this notice two specimens of a class of papers, edited by Southerners, and devoted to the cause of emigration southward. They are a very marked and auspicious sign of our times. They are among the indications of a new era of union, peace, and prosperity in our national future. We speak not now of political indications, which may be adverse enough, but of those better tendencies springing from industrial and commercial sources.

The auspiciousness of this era arises largely from a great revolution not only in the institutions, but in the feelings, policy, and very character of our Southern brethren. The period is not very long past when to have published the following sentiment, which we quote from the last-mentioned paper, would have entitled the writer in the South to the epithet of incendiary, and to at least a banishment by Judge Lynch: "*Had it not been for the unfortunate institution of slavery*, the South would not only have been the location of great cities and vast wealth, but it would have been the resort of the youths of the country to obtain a finished education." This feeling that slavery was an incubus upon the enterprise and prosperity of the country reaches every class of community. The changes for the better that have already taken place by the abandonment of the old Chinese exclusiveness imposed by the slave-holding oligarchy, and by the incoming of tourists, visitors, and immigrants, have already opened a new era which is palpable to the humblest intellect. As we were, three years ago, being driven in a hack by a "cracker" charioteer through a central section of Florida, we were pointed by him to a young orange grove near a house by the road-side, with the remark: "That man, before the war, cut down an old wild orange grove to plant corn in its place; now he has started another grove." "Why in the world did he cut down his old grove?" we inquired. "O, they didn't know nothing about transportation in them days," replied Cracker, plainly conscious of a new epoch. The other day we said to the southern-born superintendent of a large orange grove on the St. John's, now owned by

a non-resident New Englander, "We have come down now, not to fight you, but to help you build up Florida." "Yes," said he, "and if you hadn't come, I don't know how Florida would have ever gotten up." The various cities and sections are now courting northern visitors and emigrants. Jacksonville has just voted a quarter of a million dollars toward beautifying and purifying her domains. Thomasville, Georgia, has "gone crazy" over her own beauties, has made herself more beautiful, has built a splendid hotel after northern fashion, and claims, in a wide-spread pamphlet, that she is the Mecca for the northern pilgrims. Pensacola this year flashes out in an elegant circular as "a new light upon Florida." It is clear that in this race Florida, as she was earliest, still is, and must be, uppermost. Her unalienable advantage is her essentially insular position. She takes the ocean breezes from both sides, as no more northerly section can. We speak of ocean on both sides, for really the Gulf is so much ocean cut off by the long and bold projection of the Florida peninsula. And then the magnificent St. John's comes down like another Nile from the southern highlands, ready to bring the future semi-tropical productions of that virgin region. Far in that high south the Everglades are a vast inland sea, from one to six feet deep, studded with a myriad of islets, the home of a rich, luxuriant life, both vegetable and animal. It is higher than the ocean surface, and an easy drainage would, it is said, transform it into one of the richest spots upon our globe. But our main purpose is to illustrate how this abandonment of the old exclusiveness is creating a new, fraternal feeling in the common non-political mind of North and South. King Cotton is dethroned and Judge Lynch is dead; and the patriotic Unionist may rejoice that North and South are ceasing to be on terms of hate as truly as East and West.

A more humane policy in regard to the negro race is, we trust, gaining ascendency. This reaction from that era when to educate a negro was a penal offense, is rapid and hopeful. It was noted in our last Quarterly that the Legislature of Georgia has donated $8,000 to a college for colored students in Atlanta. The Legislature of South Carolina has similarly endowed our college, under Dr. Cooke, in Orangeburgh. The last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as we noted at the time, uttered not a syllable in behalf of negro education; but, from the noble sentiments of Dr. Summers, uttered in a late Nashville Advocate, we cheerfully anticipate that their next session, soon to be held, will take decisive action upon the right ground.

And when that is done, what ground of difference remains between the two Churches?

The wealth and prosperity of the South would conduce to the perpetuity of our nationality. No wise man wishes to attach her to the Union by making her an Ireland. Immigration, internal commerce, the north and south railroads, are great obliterators of sectional lines. Wealth and peaceful prosperity are the opponents of war. The reason why our Northern States were so reluctant to enter into the late war, and were so unprepared for it when it came, was, that they dreaded the loss of wealth and prosperity which war entailed. Our national debt is a reminder how wise was that dread. The South imagined she had little to lose, and that that little would be rather increased by the spoils of the near future victory. The new era is bringing a new set of thoughts, ambitions, and projects. There are visions of industrial enterprise, flourishing agriculture, productive manufacture, railroads, colleges and universities, populous towns and cities. All these enterprises speak of peace. They demand an increase of population, and inspire an open heart and hand to all other parts of our country and of the world. They may bring about a new harmony between the sections, which we earnestly trust that the politicians, secular and ecclesiastical, cannot destroy.

In furtherance of this restoration of our true and permanent nationality, nothing could be more wise and patriotic than the entire policy of President Hayes. The three great objects at which he aims are, the blending the hearts of the two sections into a firm national unity, the securing an honest repudiation of financial repudiation, and the attaining a higher and purer style of politics. These aims are right. The people of all sections, whatever the politicians may do, should rally to his support. Hampered and harrassed as he has been by factionists, and deserted by men who should have cheered and sustained him in his career, earnestly do we hope and pray that he will firmly maintain his fidelity to the righteous cause. For it is only by the success of that cause, by himself or his successors, that our country can be pure, peaceful, and prosperous.

---

*The Christian Recorder.* Philadelphia: B. T. TANNER, D.D., Editor.

This is the official organ of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and is conducted with eminent ability and success. It is the leading paper of the colored people in America. There are a number

of lesser lights; and when we consider that these periodicals have all taken existence during the brief period since the death of slavery and the resurrection into freedom, they are an auspicious omen for the race. Not long since the editor complained that every editor of the Church South refused to exchange with him. Such a refusal on their part is certainly injudicious, for some of them, at least, would, in point of ability and courtesy, be the gainers in the swap.

We consider the men of the "Recorder" to be engaged in a very important work of philanthropy. They are leading the way in the assertion for the colored race of the ability for a high civilization. It cannot be denied, it cannot be too explicitly made known, that the negro is on trial. Frederick Douglass, a few months since, told his people that twenty years would settle their case. If they were not by that time on the right level, they were a doomed race. Nor are the omens all propitious. Neither Liberia nor the West Indies shows a very encouraging upward tendency. Here in the North we have, in past years, known two instances in which the negroes withdrew into a separate community, formed in time a sort of horde, rejected the offer of school and Church, sunk, not into savageism, but into animalism, and gradually disintegrated and disappeared. It is evident that all the philanthropy, both of the whites and the cultured blacks, should be called into exertion to prove that such regress is not the inherent tendency of the race. If such exertion fail, then the inference would be solemnly drawn that "the survival of the fittest" is a law for human as well as for other races. From anti-Christian scientism the dogma would pass into the pale of Christian thinkers, that the disappearance of all other races before one supreme race is the law of nature under Providence, and its completion only a question of time. Civilization offers the alternative of acceptance or destruction. "The nation that will not serve Thee shall perish." The millennium would be the sole survivorship of the race that accepts its conditions.

But the pressures under which our negroes live entitle them to a longer period than twenty years' probation. Great as has been the improvement of the spirit of the Southern white population toward the colored race, the weight of oppression, we have reason to believe, is yet very depressing. Many who have a just and even benevolent side in every other direction have, almost unconsciously, only a hard side toward the negro. He is "only a nigger;" and the fair dealing due to others in trade, in wages, in

exact payments, in respect for rights and feelings, is unconceded to him. He has no redress from the Courts; for his oppressors would very likely be his judges and jurors. This feeling, North and South, can be revolutionized most effectively by a change wrought in the negro himself, which can come from only the Church, the school, and the newspaper.

---

*El Evangelista, Órgano de la Verdad Evangélica en el Rio de La Plata.* Montevideo.

We have received the first five numbers of the religious weekly published by our mission at Montevideo, and edited by the Rev. Thomas B. Wood. It is a handsomely printed royal octavo, folded and stitched in a tasteful cover. It is greatly to be regretted that under the pressure of the times our Missionary Board has been unable to assist in this enterprise, and that our missionaries in that field are compelled to either take it upon their own shoulders, or do without its aid. It deserves to win; and we are sure that this beginning of evangelical publications in that quarter of the globe, albeit without help, carries with it the promise of great results. It is a live sheet, practical, evangelical, earnest, adapted to immediate wants, and devoted to spiritual Christianity, and cannot fail to do great good. We trust the day may be not far distant when the Church will be able to supply all needed reinforcements of both money and men in our South American work, and that meanwhile this brave little venture may gloriously and usefully live.

---

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Prometheus, Dionysos, Sokrates, Christos;* von HEINRICH KARL HUGO DELFF. Gotha: F. A. Perthes.

A very Teutonic book! Herr Delff is hard to classify. Not a materialist; he scorns materialism. "It has been from of old the pet occupation of materialism to quibble all validity out of every thing humane, or ideal, or spiritual. Whatever new disguise it may put on, it is still the same old enemy that was long since sentenced to death and executed. It was sentenced when old Kronos was hurled into Tartaros, when Prometheus was riveted to the rocks. The conscience of humanity has long since cursed and rejected it, once and for all." Nor is the author a Christian in the churchly sense; and yet no biblical dogmatist can set higher value upon Christianity. "Christianity is the fulfillment and the end

of all our hopes. Higher and better than it, there is nothing. It is the definitive goal of the long series of partial religions that preceded it. It is the absolute *Truth*. However much contemporary thought may get bewildered in the mire of sensism, the Christian idea, the Christian spirit, cannot vanish from the horizon of humanity. *It* stands forever with flaming sword at the gates of conscience. Let no one think that the essence of Christianity can be reduced to a few rationalistic abstractions. When the roots are cut off, how can the tree retain its life? No, no! Those who are hostile to Christianity as a whole are hostile to every thing that is of worth anywhere: they are the enemies of true culture, enemies of the State, enemies of society, enemies of all high endeavor, enemies of the human race." The work of Dr. Delff is a philosophy of religion. It merits a place by the side of many other contemporary works on the subject. It is peculiar in being so thoroughly concrete. It seizes directly upon the crude pre-Christian religions, and endeavors to show how they came to *be*, how they came to decay, how they successively gave place to higher forms, until the "fullness of time" came for the absolute incarnation of the truth in Christ. *Prometheus* represented the lowest form of the religious idea. It is the religion of utility. Its highest product is civilization. It was incarnated in the prosy State of China. *Dionysos* is traced through all the Oriental mythologies. He is the symbol of something higher than utility. He is the wine god, the god of enthusiasm and poesy. Even the enthusiasm of delirium is better than the dead prosiness of mere utility. *Sokrates* is a protest against mere instinct-religions, and an appeal to the world of ideas. His death was a necessity. Either *he* had to be abolished, or the traditional religions had to go down. He groped toward the absolute religion, but he did not fully find it. Truth, as reflected through him, was only Greek truth. It was beclouded by many onesidednesses. It was partial, not universalistic, not cosmopolitan. But *Christos* is absolutely cosmopolitan. He is the *finale*. All other religions were but poor broken rays from the sun; Christ is the sun itself, without shadow of intervening veil. Christ is not the ideal of any national consciousness. Greek gods were created by Greek bards. Christ did not spring out of the Jewish consciousness. This consciousness was antagonistic to him; it repeatedly fell away from him; it rejected and crucified him. But Christ engrafted himself *into* this consciousness. He was the incarnation of the absolute ideal into humanity. He was the son of *Man*.

Christ placed the Jehovah Elohim of the Jews in a new light. He clothed him in a halo of gentleness and love. As manifested in Christ, God is no longer the slave of technical formalities, no longer the unapproachable, consuming flame of unbending justice, demanding unconditionally the death of the sinner. This awful God, Jesus, by his atoning death, metamorphosed into a pitying Father. Jesus is the daysman, receiving into his own heart the darts of absolute justice.

The nearest classification of the author is as an idealist. "The conscience of humanity pronounces idealism the truth, and naturalism a sham. The culture of humanity has long since relegated naturalism into the dead past. Any attempt at reviving it is but the galvanizing of a mummy. Its revival would be the wreck of the progress of millenniads. But it cannot be revived. The conscience of the race calls for idealism. God and nature are absolute antitheses. Monism is a superseded stand-point; it is essentially hostile to all religion, and to all high culture."

We thank Dr. Delff for his instructive guidance through the ancient mythologies. We only regret that when he uses such expressions as "Christianity is *the* truth," "Christ is Jehovah incarnate," he does not mean what the Church means.

---

*Frauenthätigkeit und Christenthum: Beitrag zur Verständigung über eine Zeitfrage*, (The Relation of Woman to Christian Work.) Von L. O. Vogt. Berlin: Prochnow, Jun.

The nine chapters of this book run thus: I. The Social Emancipation wrought by Christianity; II. The Natural Difference of the Sexes; III. The Position of Woman in Non-Christian Nations; IV. The Relation of the Sexes to each Other, according to the New Testament; V. The Influence which Christianity has had on the Position of Woman; VI. The Circumstances which are at present leading to the Enlargement of the Sphere of Female Activity; VII. The Principles which, according to Christianity, must Determine the Position of Woman; VIII. The Relation of Woman to Civil Life, to Science, and to the Church.

The general position of the author is conservative, if not reactionary. But in the course of his work he brings the champions of "women's rights" into such full discussion with the "fogies," their opponents, as to render his book of high interest to the leaders of either party. Some of the cited and discussed authors are: Riehl, *Die Familie*, Stuttgart; Heisterbergk, *Wort an Frauen über die Frau*, Gotha; Hoffmann, *Der Zustand des*

*weiblichen Geschlechts im Morgenlande;* Lewald, *Für und wider die Frauen*, Berlin; Dohm, *Die wissenschaftliche Emancipation der Frau;* Pinoff, *Reform der weiblichen Erziehung*, Breslau; Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen im Mittelalter*, Vienna; also many French and English authors.

The conclusions reached by the author are, that a true and better position for the woman of the future will, after all, result from the present earnest discussion of the whole subject; but he sees in the general spirit of the champions of emancipation a great danger to the integrity of the family, at least for the present generation. And he exclaims, with real anxiety, "Surely no patriot or Christian could, in his right mind, wish to weaken in the least the already relaxed integrity and unity of the German family!"

---

*Sainte Anselme au Bec*, (The Character of St. Anselm.) Par M. RAGEY. Paris: G. Tegni.

St. Anselm belongs to the whole Church Catholic, Protestant as well as Roman. Though chiefly known as a profound theologian, and especially as the originator of a very influential theory of the atonement, his personal character is no less interesting and eminent for all good qualities than are his speculations. The book before us is a graphic sketch of St. Anselm as a man, a Christian, and a guide of souls in the way of life. Heroic must be any man who can stamp his impress upon the world as did St. Anselm in the eleventh century. Such men rule by divine right—in virtue of what they make of themselves by fidelity to conscience and to God. It is well for the Protestant of to-day occasionally to go back on the path of history, and form fresh acquaintance with the men of God who lightened up the night of the dismal past. It intensifies our feeling of human brotherhood. It gives us a salutary consciousness of our communion with the Church general in all times and nations, and sects. The chain of saints is a chain which stretches along *all* the ages. There have been no great blanks in it. The ancient Church and the patristic Church had their "saints." So has the modern Church. And the galaxy of the Middle Ages stands between and fills up the chasm. The book of Professor Ragey is written with a careful Christian hand.

---

*Das Vaterunser.* Von S. F. EVERTSBUSCH, HEYDER, und ZIMMER. Frankfurt-au-Main.

An excellent book, of 330 pages, on the Lord's Prayer. The author classifies the prayer thus: The invocation, the *seven* peti-

tions, and the conclusion. His work is a practical treatise on the whole round of the Christian life. It is a needed work. Query, Do not we Methodists make too little of the Lord's Prayer? Do not a large majority of our preachers positively disregard the "Discipline" by neglecting to conclude the opening prayer of both morning and evening service with the Lord's Prayer? What is the explanation of this? Have we not fallen into such a hortatory and rhetorical style of praying as to find it embarrassing to step down into the childlike simplicity of the words of Christ? Or, what is the real reason? The matter is, at least, worthy of attention.

---

*Intempérance et Misère.* Par J. LEFORT. Paris: Guillaumin et Cie.

This book comes from the legal profession, and is deserving of attention. It has been crowned by the "Academy of Moral and Political Sciences," and has the good-will of the best men of France. Its three parts are: 1. Intemperance, its Nature, History, Geographical Distribution, and Occasions; 2. Intemperance and Pauperism; 3. Means of Repression, Penal and Fiscal Laws, Temperance Societies, etc. The chapter on the history of intemperance in the past is very instructive; so, also, that on the occasions of the vice. The author, with all his moral and religious earnestness against the enormous evil, lingers behind the American stand-point. He even doubts whether the total abandonment of wine in Northern France would be hygienic wisdom. But the actual evils of excess he combats and portrays as earnestly as could possibly be desired. In the practical questions here discussed, public sentiment is nowhere so far advanced as in our own United States.

---

*Der Werth des Lebens,* (The Value of Life.) Von DR. E. DÜHRING. Leipzig: Roisland.

Dr. Dühring is the blind philosopher of Berlin. He writes in genial style, and spices most of his pages with wit and irony. He greatly admires Schopenhauer, but as earnestly antagonizes his philosophy. Life is not a pessimistic delusion, fit only to be thrust back into night; but the good of existence far outweighs the evil. Dühring looks hopefully to the future, both of philosophy and of society.

---

*Die Forschung Nach der Materie,* (Search after Matter.) Von J. HUBER. München: T. Ackermann.

What is matter? Professor Huber is not a materialist. Mind is anterior to matter, and above it. Matter cannot be made to ex-

plain the phenomena of mind. To endow material atoms (and who knows what a material atom is?) with life and power, is only to dodge the question. Animated atoms are simply atoms *plus* life. A materialist who assumes animated atoms, unwittingly gives up his materialistic foundation. Professor Huber's book ably refutes the mechanical theory of the universe.

---

*Theorie und Erfahrung*, (Theory and Experience,) von DR. P. KRAMER. Halle: L. Nebert.

A candid discussion of Darwinism, with anti-Darwinian conclusions. Darwinism rests upon a too narrow basis. The facts or principles which it admits are inadequate for the results which it infers.

---

## *Miscellaneous.*

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum ad Brutum Libri Quinque.* Recognovit REINHOLDUS KLOTZ. Novi Eboraci: Apud Harperos Fratres. MDCCCLXXVIII.

*A Manual of the Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. 12mo., pp. 596. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

Seven years since, Professor Huxley published his "Manual of the Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals," in half performance of a purpose formed twenty-two years ago, and with this volume he gives us the other half. It is devoted to the morphology of the Invertebrates, with only incidental reference to their physiology and distribution, and with none to their ætiology, save in half a dozen pages of the Introduction.

*Why a Catholic in the Nineteenth Century?* By WILLIAM GILES DIX. 16mo., pp. 101. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1878.

Mr. Dix, a pervert to Romanism, means *Roman* Catholic. He forgets many things, and seems to suppose the world to have forgotten them too, such as the history of the Middle Ages, and of the last twenty years as well, the Syllabus of 1864, and the universal war of Rome with religious liberty.

*A History of Methodism, for Our Young People.* By WILLIAM W. BENNETT, D.D. 16mo., pp. 273. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

An attractive sketch of Mr. Wesley and of the rise and growth of Methodism to the time of his death, with a summary of subsequent progress in the final chapter. Our young people should have it.

*Bessie, the Cash Girl.* By Mrs. MARY D. BRINE. Two Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 195. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1878.

A capital little book for the juveniles.

*Through a Needle's Eye.* By HESBA STRATTON, author of "Bede's Charity," "The King's Servants," "Brought Home," etc. 16mo., pp. 433. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company. 1878.

Decidedly one of the better class of works of fiction.

*The Old Looking-Glass;* or, Mrs. Dorothy Cope's Recollections. By MARIA LOUISA CHARLESWORTH, author of "Ministering Children," etc. 16mo., pp. 268. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

*School History of Rome from the Foundation of the City to the Extinction of the Empire of the West.* Abridged from Dean Merivale's General History of Rome, with the Sanction of the Author. By C. PULLER, M.A., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With Thirteen Maps. 16mo., pp. xxiv, 390. New York: Harper & Brothers.

*Harper's Half-Hour Series.* 32mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.
John Milton.—Lord Byron. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 139.
My Lady's Money. By WILKIE COLLINS. Pp. 216.
Poor Zeph! By F. W. ROBINSON. Pp. 125.
The Earl of Chatham. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 204.
William Pitt. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 102.
John Hampden.—Lord Burleigh. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 133.
Field-Marshal Count Moltke's Letters from Russia. Translated from the German by GRACE BIGELOW. Pp. 181.
The Bride of Landeck. By G. P. R. JAMES. Pp. 102.
Brother Jacob.—The Lifted Veil. By GEORGE ELIOT. Pp. 169.
The Tender Recollections of Irene Macgillicuddy. Pp. 94.
A Shadow on the Threshold. By MARY CECIL HAY. Pp. 128.
Frederic the Great. By LORD MACAULAY. Pp. 125.

*All Saints' Day and Other Sermons.* By Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY, M.A., Late Rector of Eversley and Canon of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. W. Harrison, M.A. 12mo., pp. 410. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1878.

*History of Opinions on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution.* By EDWARD BEECHER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 334. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

*Epochs of Modern History.* The Beginning of the Middle Ages. By R. W. CHURCH, Dean of St. Paul's. With Three Maps. 16mo., pp. xxii, 226. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

*State Regulation of Vice.* Regulation Efforts in America. The Geneva Congress. By AARON M. POWELL. 16mo., pp. 127. New York: Wood & Holbrook. 1878.

*Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year* 1877. 8vo., pp. 396. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

*A Jewel of a Girl.* A Novel. By the Author of "Queenie," etc. 8vo., pp. 137. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Two Tales of Married Life.* Hard to Bear. By GEORGIANA M. CRAIK. A True Man. By M. C. STIRLING. 8vo., pp. 118. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Young Musgrave.* A Novel. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. 8vo., pp. 144. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Green Pastures and Piccadilly.* A Novel. By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "A Princess of Thule," etc., in Conjunction with an American Writer. 8vo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The Wreck of the "Grosvenor."* An Account of the Mutiny of the Crew and the Loss of the Ship when trying to make the Bermudas. 8vo., pp. 120. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Notices of the following books are postponed to next number:

*The Christian's Heritage,* and other Sermons.

*The Art of Beauty.*

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1878.

## ART I. — THE DOCTRINES AND DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE Book of Discipline is regarded by many with a respect akin to the reverence felt for the Holy Scriptures. In those pioneer days when the itinerant's portable library always contained the Bible, the Hymn Book, and the Discipline, this reverence was begotten. It does, indeed, represent and regulate more vitality than any other ecclesiastical book in America. It is the guide and final appeal of ten thousand pastors and Quarterly Conferences, and of all the District and Annual Conferences, and of a million and a half of members. The Discipline of the Church, South, is also essentially identical with it.

Americans, more than any other people, are governed by written constitutions and statutes. The Methodist Episcopal Church, more than any other Church, has adopted this American practice. Government by written constitutions has some serious disadvantages. It is hampered by the "letter," which sometimes "killeth;" and strict constructionists idolatrously worship forms of speech which were adopted by men who may have been inferior to their successors in ability, as they must have been younger in experience of history, and who could not have anticipated all the effects of their own enactments. Where the written constitution is absent, or is unimportant, as in the British Government, and also in the English Wesleyan ecclesiastical government, conservatives are inclined to wor-

ship precedent. But any government may, if the exigency seems to justify it, make a new precedent. To override a written compact is not so easy; still, all are familiar with the apothegm of the British judge about a four-horse chariot and an act of Parliament.

The Methodist Discipline has been much changed. Parts of it are utterly unlike the first forms. A new edition is published quadrennially, embracing the amendments made by the latest General Conference. We assume that our readers are aware that there is a small part of the Discipline over which the General Conference has no power. To change these parts would be a revolution. They cannot alter, subtract from, or add to the twenty-five Articles of Religion. It is singular that, notwithstanding this explicit provision, efforts have been made to revise the creed. The excellent report of the Bishops on a revised creed that had been submitted to them for examination, made at the General Conference of 1876, has probably finally settled the impossibility of such action.* Another part of the constitution that, by implication, cannot be changed without a revolution, is the very provision that limits the power of the General Conference. If that could be nullified by a majority vote all the restrictions would be useless.

It is, however, worthy of our inquiry, whether Americans are not liable to become idolaters of "constitutions." No other peoples, ancient or modern, seem to have found it so necessary for one generation to hamper all succeeding generations by specifying just how much their successors shall or shall not do. What could possibly give the less than a hundred young ministers who first adopted the Discipline prescience and wisdom enough to set limits to the power of all their successors, to the latest generations? It is not to be wondered at that "constitutions," when they conflict with what seems right and prudent, are compelled to yield—for every generation must assume its own responsibilities and bear its own burdens. We should educate our successors so that they may be trusted. Still, it is doubtful whether the Methodist Episcopal Church will ever find it needful to modify its Articles of Religion. They are, indeed, the product of the thought and controversies of other times. They are fragmentary and incomplete. They speak with

* General Conference Journal, 1876, p. 206.

great distinctness on subjects that are not now discussed, and omit some of the most fundamental questions on doctrines of religion. As a creed, they fail to represent the belief of Methodists, and exert but little influence. They ought to be amended, but the letter of the "constitution" forbids—a clear instance of bondage to a form of words.

Yet no Church maintains a greater uniformity of belief, especially among the ministers, than the Methodist Churches, probably by the itinerancy of the preachers, which naturally represses all eccentricity that will interfere with the general acceptability of a pastor.

All other parts of the Discipline except the Articles of Religion can be changed, some few rules requiring the concurrence of three fourths of the members of the General Conference present and voting, and two thirds of the members of the Annual Conferences present and voting—all the rest requiring only a simple majority vote of the General Conference. The natural consequence is, that every General Conference finds itself beset at its opening by a flood of propositions to alter the letter of the Discipline in different parts, which are usually referred in due form to committees early in the session, whence it appears at first as though the entire book would be so transformed that neither friend nor foe would be able to recognize anything in the new issue but the title; and, indeed, it has been gravely proposed to change that. A majority of these propositions are disapproved in the committee room; others, reported upon favorably, are never acted upon by the General Conference; others are rejected, and a residue are discussed, modified, and adopted; and the consequence is that many of the substantial features of the Discipline as it was in 1780 remain the same in the last edition of 1876. Yet there have been many amendments, and many additions, and some abolishments. The book is far better, both in letter and character, and as an embodiment of ecclesiastical law and experience, than ever before. To declaim against all changes in the letter and arrangement of the Discipline is sentimental. It shows a lack of moral courage. Every thing alive must accommodate itself to actual facts and demands. All who have the constitutional right to vote, directly or indirectly, for an improvement of the Discipline, have a right to advocate the improvement, and advice

even from others should not be spurned. We propose in this article, published about midway between the sessions of two General Conferences, when the Church may be supposed to have the least possible feverish interest in the subject, to recommend some improvements in our present Discipline.

We premise that no committee of a General Conference should fail to report as early as possible to the General Conference its opinion on any proposition referred to it. A committee has no right to stifle any subject committed to it. Let a timely report be made, and let the whole General Conference act upon it. Again, the practice that has prevailed in our General Conferences, of loading the table with reports and propositions of various kinds, and then at about the beginning of the fifth week appointing the Bishops, or the Bishops and the Chairmen of the Standing Committees, to decide what business shall come before the Conference, and what shall be rejected without discussion, is unbecoming the dignity of such a body. A committee has the right to claim that the General Conference should in all cases clear the table, even if it should require six months to do it. They might fix a day, say the twentieth day of the session, after which no new business should be introduced without the consent of three fourths, which should be tested without debate; and also fix a day previous to which all committees should make their final report; but then they should quietly sit and dispose of every proposition before them. Such a course only is worthy the dignity and responsibility of such a body.

Changes may be sought in the Discipline, either to improve the literature and character of the book, or actually to improve the economy of the Church. We propose to consider these two classes of changes.

The literary style of the Discipline had, at first, some remarkably good characteristics, and also some eccentricities that should not be perpetuated. John Wesley, in the beginning of his wonderful work, used to hold what he called "Conversations between Mr. John and Charles Wesley, and others," the published minutes of which were the first written bond of union of the few "people called Methodists." These "conversations" were universally drawn up in the form of questions and answers, "Q." personating the inquirer, and "A." the

final authority. There is no hint that the Conference ever formally voted. Every thing was in the uniform tread of Q. and A. Annually a catechism of this kind was published from 1765 to the death of Mr. Wesley, in which appears much matter of only a local and temporary interest. Now, it so happened when the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in this country, and the first edition of our Discipline was published, this system of question and answer was adopted, and very much matter that at best was of only temporal value was inserted in the text. Mr. Wesley published no pastoral addresses. Every thing that he wished to say, however insignificant, that was yet deemed worthy to go into "Annual Minutes," was printed; and when our Discipline came to be made up much of this matter was inserted, without due regard to its permanent application to a people three thousand miles away. When the English Wesleyans came to publish a book entitled "The Sunday Service of the Methodists, with other Occasional Services," they wisely omitted all such matter, and their Annual Minutes of the present day omit all the temporary pastoral advice given a hundred years ago by John Wesley, much of which is retained in our Discipline. The parts of the Discipline to which this remark applies are particularly paragraphs 115–129 inclusive; 135–143 inclusive. We do not undervalue the genuine piety inculcated in these words of advice, but our criticism is that they are not suited to be a stereotyped description of what Methodists need, and when thus stereotyped they soon become obsolete and worthless. They partake of the nature of cant. Mr. Wesley wrote them for the time, and used to vary his exhortations. We would much prefer to have our Discipline free from such exhortations, and that each General Conference should appoint a committee to write a full discriminating Pastoral Address, which, indeed, with great propriety, might be printed in the Appendix of the Discipline—a special address for every edition. The absurdity of one of the directions in paragraph 124 is evident: "We recommend a serious perusal of 'The Cause, Evils, and Cures of Heart and Church Divisions.'" Not a hundred ministers out of our ten thousand ever saw the tract. Mr. Wesley's Minutes abounded in similar minute directions, which he struck out from following editions. For instance: from 1772

to 1808, every edition of the Annual Minutes had these strange questions and answers:—

*Q.* How far does each of you agree to submit to the judgment of the majority?

*A.* In speculative things each can only submit so far as his judgment shall be convinced. In every practical point each will submit so far as he can without wounding his conscience.

*Q.* Can a Christian submit further than this to any man or body of men upon earth?

*A.* It is undeniable; he cannot, either to council, bishop, or convocation. And this is that grand principle of private judgment on which all the reformers proceeded.

In this is seen Mr. Wesley's liberality, so much in advance of his age, and this stood in the Minutes thirty-six years. It certainly deserves a place in our Discipline far more than the sections above referred to. Yet we would have no such, or similar, advice in the book. In the Minutes from 1780 to 1789 was found the following: "Avoid quaint words, however in fashion, as 'object,' 'originate,' 'very,' 'high,' etc." In that we see the delicacy of taste of the refined and conservative scholar. All the words he "objected" to are now "very" common, and Methodist preachers use them without rebuke. In 1789 he had the good sense to omit this direction; but the same year he introduced this advice to his ministers: "Wear no slouched hat!" Perhaps it might be well to reintroduce that. How should we like to see the following in the Discipline, from Mr. Wesley's Minutes of 1780? "After preaching take a little lemonade, mild ale, or candied orange-peel. All spirituous liquors, at that time especially, are deadly poisons." Occasionally the Wesleyans for some years introduced similar directions in their Annual Minutes. As, for instance, in the Minutes for 1800 we find, "We think some of our hearers are in danger of mistaking emotions of the affections for experimental and practical godliness. To remedy or prevent as far as possible these errors, let Mr. Wesley's extract of Mr. Edwards' pamphlet on the Religious Affections be printed without delay, and circulated among our people." But we need not multiply instances. A stereotyped book, like our Discipline, is no place for such counsel, as though given to a whole Church, and applicable to all time. Mr. Wesley is far more honored by having them omitted than by having them con-

tinually repeated without producing any good effect. We think, also, that the old chapter on Slavery, paragraph 36, is obsolete. It is no more needed than a chapter on idolatry or cannibalism. It dignifies the dead carcass of slavery too much to retain this chapter. There are a great many associations, pleasant and otherwise, connected with it, but a book of doctrines and discipline is not to be maintained for associations, but for use and dignity. The obliteration of the chapter would be an improvement. The "rules relating to marriage," paragraphs 41–44, are entirely neglected. We either need less or more on that subject. It would be much better to do as our Wesleyan brethren do, leave all such matters to the Annual Minutes, or to the quadrennial pastoral addresses. Can any one give a good reason for that little remnant of a chapter on "Dress," now found in paragraph 49? "This is no time to encourage superfluity in dress." Why not, at this time as well as any other? When was there, or when will there be, "a time" to do it? Who does not see that this was a temporary note of Mr. Wesley, never designed for a permanent statute? Had he been called upon to frame a law for a century and for all nations he would have expressed better thought in a more suitable style. As a permanent part of the Discipline it is simply nonsense. It is always well to bury the dead. Our quadrennial pastoral addresses should not be unmeaning generalities, prefaced and ended by the hackneyed quotations from an apostolic epistle, but a true vital discriminating setting forth of present wants and duties. Let us have a brief valuable pastoral address in every edition of the Discipline.

The committee on revisals of 1872 greatly improved the mechanical form of the Discipline, and would have done much more had their full report been allowed to come before the Conference. At this time the formal "questions" disappeared and the answers alone remained, and the order of the matter was greatly modified.

So far we have spoken on the mere form of the Book, but now we approach a much more difficult subject, and one that well deserves all the space that can be afforded to our article—the changes demanded in the actual economy of the Church, to be introduced by slight changes in the phraseology of the Discipline. The modifications proposed with the most

definiteness relate to the Episcopacy, the Presiding Eldership, and the abolishment of the limitation of the preachers' service to three successive years in any one appointment, till after the lapse of three more years.

Some have expressed the thought that our system of government would be improved if our Bishops were elected for four years, perhaps eligible to one re-election. They say this would complete the analogy of our system. We have no other life-offices. Our Bishops are really elders appointed for specific work; let all temptations to the adoption of any other theory be removed. If there is any foolish tendency to ecclesiastical pride and servility, let it be checked early in our history.

These arguments are not unworthy of notice, and it should never be forgotten that the Church has this matter under its own control. The General Conference is supreme, and should the Episcopacy ever become unpopular or unprofitable such propositions would be earnestly agitated. The great branches of Methodism have different methods of securing what all believe to be essential to its spirit, a warm evangelicalism or earnest experimental piety, a striking uniformity of religious belief, and the itinerancy of the ministry. Lose either of these, and Methodism is so transformed as to deserve a new name. The British Wesleyans secure these by what may be called a select or aristocratic Annual Conference, representing the whole body, having its one annual president or bishop. This select Conference, embracing now a body of lay advisers and co-operators, has all ultimate power, and controls the various subordinate organizations. The greater part of the ministers are never members of any Conference above a District Conference. It would be positively impossible to introduce any thing like this in America. Such a system must grow, and will not bear transplanting. In Canada a system has been adopted about midway between the British and American. They have Annual Conferences embracing all the ministers—not, as in England, a select few—a delegated General Conference meeting once in four years, and a president who is practically superintendent, or bishop, for four years.

The Methodist Episcopal Church claims to be the best representation of John Wesley's maturest thoughts on Church organization. His advice was not slavishly followed, but it

had great influence, and the first Discipline undoubtedly received his approval. The superintendents or bishops are not a reproduction of the bishops of the early, or medieval, or the English Church. They have scarcely any thing in common with them but the name. They are the perpetual presidents of the General Conferences and the Annual Conferences, with the usual duty of presidents, temporarily to decide questions of order and law; empowered to determine the number of the districts in the Annual Conferences, and to appoint elders to the charge of them, and to appoint the remaining elders and preachers—with a few exceptions—to their fields of labor; in the intervals of the Annual Conferences to change, receive, and suspend preachers, according to disciplinary directions; to exercise a general and undefined supervision; and to ordain such as are designated for the purpose by the Annual Conferences. Besides these, other duties may or may not be imposed upon them. Every one can see that the chief function and demand of their office is to maintain the regularity of the meetings of the Annual Conferences, and the annual appointments of all the preachers, observing the restrictions and rules which they do not make and cannot modify, but are charged to execute. Men to perform this office will need no undefined and indefinable halo, such as the unthinking may suppose to be connected with a fabulous apostolic succession. They are elders, selected to perform a peculiar and responsible work. The Church will naturally choose for this office men of mature years and judgment, of unquestioned integrity and piety, and of good general ability, and of not too pronounced peculiarity. Eccentricity would be deemed objectionable.

If the office should become practically a sinecure, or too great a temptation to ambition, or in any way fail to promote the zeal and self-denial and piety and success of the ministry and the welfare of the people, the Church can modify it so as to reach the designed purpose. The power of the Episcopacy is, therefore, just what it ought to be, chiefly *moral*. It has great influence because it deserves it, because its incumbents are modest and earnest, and working, like the rest of the ministry, for the salvation of men.

The most of the propositions to modify the Episcopacy exhibit this fatal weakness—the lack of justifying occasion.

They are urged on theoretical grounds. Indeed, no modifications have ever been seriously proposed, except to limit their power by taking away the responsibility of determining how many presiding elders there should be, and of appointing the incumbents, and to restrict still further the appointments of the preachers. Besides these propositions, it has been suggested that the bishops be elected for four years, eligible to a re-election. The propositions that affect the presiding eldership and the stationing of the preachers will be best considered elsewhere. It has also been proposed to district the entire territory of the Church, so as to assign to each bishop for four years a certain definite field specially to supervise, in addition to his share in a certain residue of general interests. It is urged in behalf of a limited term of service for the bishops that it would be in better analogy with all the other offices under control of the General Conference, such as the editors and corresponding secretaries, and also with the office of presiding elder. Judging from what has been done in Canada and elsewhere, it is very likely that if it were left to the Church practically to decide the question *de novo*, many would prefer a presidency of a limited time. The temptations to forget the well established theory of the Church on ordination would be less; the certainty of securing the highest efficiency in the presiding officers would be greater; the retiring incumbents would be superannuated preachers, not superannuated presidents or bishops; and the avowed simplicity of the Church theory on the subject would be maintained. Nor do we think that the frequency of elections in the General Conference could sensibly add to any unhealthy excitement on the subject. The proper way to diminish that is to make the offices desirable chiefly for increased usefulness.

But changes are seldom made from mere theoretical considerations. Practically, our bishops are men of mature experience, who find after obtaining their office no field of ambition open before them but simply to perform their duties in the most efficient way possible. Their office is easily understood, abundant in labor, and furnishing simply a comfortable support; and all the traditions of the past and incentives of the present combine to demand vigilance and faithfulness and impartiality. The law-making authorities of the Church

will, therefore, not be likely to disturb the tenure of office; and all the less so since the General Conference consists so largely of laymen—for the laity are constitutionally little concerned about questions of priority or gradation in the ministry.

In behalf of districting the work of the bishops, many strong reasons may be urged. It would concentrate and greatly increase the influence of the bishop in his own district. He could easily make himself powerfully felt in the course of four years throughout one tenth or fifteenth of the Church. He could, in addition to presiding at the Annual Conferences, preside at many of the District Conferences, and become personally acquainted with the schools, the Churches, and all the leading Church enterprises of his district. It would be a saving of expense of money and of time, now consumed in travel. It would more uniformly distribute the labor of the bishops, substituting individual responsibility for a kind of communism, which always inures to the advantage of the weak and discourages the strong.

The tendency of advancement is universally toward division of labor and responsibility. Once the circuit system prevailed, and the influence of a pastor was spread over many societies. Human nature is too strong for this system, except where the societies are too weak to resist it. So, it is urged, the universality of the field of the episcopal labor must yield to make the influence of the bishop more palpable and valuable.

To all this it is objected, first, that it would "violate the constitution!" They shall not "destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency." And, forsooth, are those few words, adopted by a hundred men, a hundred years ago, to bind the judgment of all their successors in all time, so that nothing whatsoever can be done which the greatest human ingenuity may pronounce a violation of this phrase? Such general words must have a general interpretation, or the iron bar will break. "A general superintendency" is maintained, though every general superintendent is not required to visit every spot in the vast domain of the Church once every month, or once even in any decade of years. It is not proposed that a permanent diocese be erected for each bishop. This would violate the principle of general superintendency. Our preachers are itinerant, and our presiding elders and our bishops should be

itinerant. They should change their districts, as others change their fields of labor, to make the itinerancy perfect. But this does not prevent each one from having a particular field under his charge for a limited time. It is objected, secondly, that this system would interfere with the proper visitation of our foreign missionary fields. But certainly there ought to be sufficient constructive and legislative power in a General Conference to provide for this exigency. Perhaps one bishop might spend the whole of a quadrennium in this work, and do it with more efficiency and less expense than in the present system.

The time is not far distant when some important problems will grow out of this foreign missionary work. "The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America" cannot well cover and manage the interests of all who ought to be Methodists in all the world. It is to be hoped that there will be magnanimity and true Christianity enough ere long, in the different Methodist bodies which support missions, to encourage all their mission societies in some of the larger nations to unite in one Church, which shall be allowed to form its own government according to the views of the majority. This would not imply the cessation or diminution of the missionary contributions, so long as they are needed. A sentiment that should confine missionary aid to absolute denominational attachments is narrow and unchristian. A desire to have one gigantic Church, rather than a fraternity of Churches, is Hildebrandic rather than Christian. Let the nineteenth century show a principle and wisdom nobler than the thirteenth. What we most need in all our body, bishops, preachers, and members, is not a longing after power and pomp and parade, but after the salvation of souls.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has a providential and efficient system of government. Its Episcopacy is one of its noblest elements. But, like all the rest, it is undoubtedly subject to changes. Nothing truly efficient is inelastic and unimprovable. We do not believe that any changes proposed to diminish its influences should be favored, and unless the adoption of the district system would insure its efficiency it should not be made.

The presiding eldership is the next peculiar feature that some propose to modify. Like almost all truly valuable insti-

tutions, the presiding eldership had an obscure origin, the legislation rather following than providing for its changes till it had assumed a definite form. It may gratify curiosity, but it really should have little weight on subsequent legislation, to ascertain just what authority the first presiding elders had in those days of feebleness when the Methodist Episcopal Church was assuming form. In experience the fathers were children, and the present generation are the fathers. In piety we are willing to accord to the natural fathers the front rank, but we will not reproach them with the charge of having weakened their own Church organization, or with having raised up a generation that has done it. For this reason we feel but a slight interest in the discussions of the early or even later history of the origin and proposed changes of the presiding eldership. It is, indeed, true that during the first decade of the history of the Church animated discussions took place on the question. For this many reasons can be given. The Church was then assuming its character. Discussions were necessarily mostly theoretical. Politicians, both civil and ecclesiastical, naturally take great interest in such themes, especially in the absence of more practical matters. The great enterprises now embodied in the Missionary, Church Extension, Sunday-School, Educational, Tract, and Freedmen's Aid Societies, and others of the kind, were yet undeveloped. Mere Church economy absorbed the most of the thoughts of legislators during the sessions of Conferences. In these discussions some of our most honored names are found successively for and against a change in the presiding eldership, though in all cases the final result was against any great modification of the plan reached in the first decade of the Church, and we do not recollect a single instance of a man starting in opposition to the change and ending in its favor. There are, however, several notable instances of the opposite. This is significant.

The first great secession of the Church, also, under the leadership of Rev. James O. Kelly, was the direct result of a determination to make the presiding elders elective by the ministers. The leaders of the party who set up for themselves are said to have been equal in talents to those who adhered to the Church. Some think they were superior as economists. They are not charged with deficiency in religion or zeal; they took with

them a sufficiently large part of the preachers and membership to try a fair experiment. The Church was young and the country young, and they had a fair field in which to test their methods; and yet now, after about eighty years of experiment, there is not a State, or a country, or a single city, in which they have succeeded so well as the mother Church. Truly this, too, is significant! Why should we harass our minds in the discussion of abstract theories about practical questions, when we have the inductive evidence of their value before our eyes?

The presiding eldership as it is, in our opinion, should be credited with having originated and maintained at least a third of our present societies. We regard it as the most efficient and most economical system of episcopal supervision and of home missionary work ever devised—the joint product of human skill and divine Providence—to co-operate with our Episcopacy in carrying out our itinerancy of the ministry, so as to secure the constant activity of the members and the constant supply of the Churches.

The living economy of the Church has adapted itself to this institution. It has become a part of our vitality. The presiding elders, it is true, seem theoretically invested with great power. Under their counsel, often greatly influenced by them, the presiding bishop theoretically assigns all the preachers of a Conference annually to their fields of labor. But who does not know the numerous limitations of this power, that cannot be recognized by legislation? Again, these presiding elders are no separate independent caste. The presiding elders receive their own appointments annually. No one can preside over one district more than four years, nor again over that district till after an interval of six years. If any Conference express a wish that no one shall serve in the office more than one term at a time, the wish, so far as is known, is always granted. It is not usually an office desirable for worldly ease or profit. The present system combines elasticity with order, allowing a presiding elder to be changed at any time during the session of the Conference, and even, in extraordinary instances, after the close of a session—an exigency which it would be practically impossible to provide for under any system of election. Again, the judicial economy of the Church is indissolubly connected with the present system. All the questions growing

out of complaints, trials and the result, and appeals, are so incorporated with the present system that a radical change of it would be almost equivalent to a dissolution of the itinerancy and an attempt to reconstruct it on a new model. There is really no valid reason why the preachers should elect the presiding elders, and assign them their fields of labor, any more than why they should assign each other their fields of labor.

For these reasons we are of opinion that from time to time, when the Church has no weightier business on hand, discussion of the presiding eldership will arise in the papers and Conferences, and the result will probably be, as heretofore, a determination to resist any considerable changes in the old system.

The proposal to abolish the law that forbids a preacher to remain in one pastoral charge more than three years, or his return till after the expiration of three years, or that he shall serve in the same charge more than three years in six, has never yet been warmly advocated in a General Conference, nor elicited a very formidable support. Still, there are some successful preachers and some enterprising laymen who doubt whether the Church really gains by the present law. Their arguments are as follows:—

1. The restriction seems to have been made originally without due consideration. At first some of the preachers were required to exchange their appointments at the end of six months, and when it was found that a few were likely to become permanent pastors the two years' rule was adopted, which has been extended to three years without inconvenience. Why not extend the term indefinitely?

2. Long pastorates have peculiar power. We envy other denominations their influence arising from a few Churches under the leadership of men of a marked personality. Our denomination is not wanting in such men, who, if they had opportunity, would reach similar results. Many of our ministers feel that they lose power by their frequent changes of pastoral charge.

3. Methodism is not as efficient in the cities as in the country. Some other denominations are more efficient in the city than in the country. Is not this attributable to the itinerancy?

4. Let us have freedom. Let our bishops, with the advice of the presiding elders, be clothed with unrestricted power. Let them have authority to change the pastoral charge of every preacher every year if they see fit; or let the authority of the bishops be restricted, so that they shall not change the pastoral charge of any minister unless he, or the Church, or both, ask for it. Here, of course, is room for much legislation, to define how a pastor or a Church may ask for a new appointment.

We have stated these arguments briefly but fairly, and more forcibly than we have seen them stated by any who seem to believe in their validity. But, notwithstanding the plausibility of these arguments, we cannot favor this change of the Discipline. It would infallibly destroy all itinerancy in less than twenty-five years. No denomination would submit to have a bishop, or a body of bishops, decide whether the preachers should change their appointments, and then settle them, *unguided by law.* On the other hand, if the Episcopacy is simply to appoint ministers who desire to move, over Churches that desire other pastors, it will sink into insignificance and perish.

There are two kinds of loyalty—loyalty to persons and loyalty to law. So there are two kinds of authority, the authority of persons and the authority of law. The former is bondage, the latter is freedom. In a State, absolute despotism is properly tempered by assassination, if the despot will not retire; in a Church, supreme personal authority is not to be thought of. The itinerancy, therefore, must not be under the control of the bishops. They are to execute, not to make, law. They should not even be allowed to make the occasion for the execution of the law. Removing the limitation of *law* would so increase the responsibility and power of the bishops that both they and the itinerancy would soon disappear together.

But if there is to be an itinerancy when and where individuals—either ministers only, or Churches, or both—shall choose, then the itinerancy is doomed. It would be too capricious to be tolerated. In such a case the bishop would be a mere umpire to aid undesirable pastors to find undesirable Churches.

But now look at the present facts, and see the beauty and majesty of impartial LAW, not merely submitted to, but cheerfully adopted and obeyed by all, for the universal good. The

whole denomination, for convenience, is divided into Conferences of about one hundred and twenty societies and preachers each. Transferences from one Conference to another are voluntary. As no preacher can remain more than three years at any appointment, usually about one fifth—never quite one third —*must* be changed. This is not decided by the bishop, but by the LAW. That precludes all argumentation. It precludes all personal tyranny. It is the system—it is not personal caprice—that decides this fact. Always a fair proportion of the ablest preachers and of the strongest Churches are among those that must change. These would not usually seek a change for personal reasons, but now yield to it because it is the law. If the minister is very popular, and the Church is entirely satisfied, so much the better, and so much more is the law honored. We would have it so always if we could. The ideal requires that every pastor and every Church should not desire a change for personal reasons. This makes the duty of the bishop respectable. He is not arranging places for malcontents. He is appointing popular preachers to desirable places. It will not do just to fill the vacancies with ministers who have served out their term; some have died; some have retired from active work; some new preachers are admitted. Some preachers who have not filled out all the time possible to them may be sent to some vacant Churches for mutual accommodation; this makes other vacancies; and thus the fact that a large number of preachers MUST go to new appointments renders the whole system respectable, and much more easily worked than it otherwise could be. We repeat, take away the legal, impersonal compulsion, and the system would speedily collapse.

The fact is, that the Methodists all over the world have grown into power under a regular inflexible itinerancy of the ministry, *required by law*, and regulated by the chosen executors of law. They prefer the system, with all its disadvantages, for its superior advantages. We say "with all its disadvantages," for every system implies limitations. We freely confess that the itinerancy has some disadvantages. So has every practical system, actual or conceivable. Congregationalism has some advantages over a connected Church, but actual trial proves, also, that it has many weaknesses. Perhaps an

itinerancy of the ministers would not be the best for the entire Church of Christ; but, be this as it may, if a century's history has proved any thing, it is that Methodists ought to adhere to it. One great body of Christians should maintain it. The more popular their ministers, and the more the Churches admire and love them at the end of their term of service, the more faithfully should all adhere to the law.

All the arguments urged in behalf of the repeal of this law are sufficiently answered by this one statement: The Methodists of this generation desire to maintain the character with which they started, and which has been strengthening for about one hundred and fifty years. Their pastors have always been itinerant from a general legal choice. We do not envy other denominations their beautiful long pastorates. We wonder they have so few, and if they are really efficient we hope they may have many more. We also have bishops and many itinerant pastors who have a reputation not confined to one locality, but in some cases almost cosmopolitan, in others national, in others embracing a Conference; and though "comparisons are odious," yet, if our system is attacked, we can show that by it the influence and power and usefulness of men of great mental power and spiritual worth is not diminished, but enhanced. We believe that as John Wesley and Bishop Asbury were respectively the most widely known and the most useful Christian teachers in their generation and in their two nations, so the system of itinerancy gives ample play for the greatest possible success. We will show man for man, according to our numbers, whom God has blessed with as great reputation and usefulness as any other men in any other branch of the Church of Christ.

Instead of asking why Methodism does not succeed as well in the cities as in the country, it might be well to ask why, beginning in a city, it has outstripped all others in the rural districts, and at the same time accomplished so much in the cities? What need is there of any more settled pastorates in the cities? Cannot the almost numberless denominations that have that system supply the demand, without calling upon the only people that have another system to help them? The cities as yet have more wickedness than the country. There are many who desire a Christian profession, who, nevertheless, do not admire the Methodist strictness or usages. But why

should we murmur at that? Can the cities of the United States afford to lose the Methodist Episcopal Church, even with its itinerant ministry? If any of our preachers or people prefer a settled ministry, can they not find it? With the most perfect good feeling, we say that Church connection ought not to be decided chiefly by heredity, but by a mature and sound judgment. If any desire a settled pastorate, by all means find one—but find it outside of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The true ideal of the Christian Church is unity of purpose, with a variety of organization; and the world does need one large vigorous denomination with an itinerant ministry.

Itinerancy tends to preserve orthodoxy, as heresy is far less profitable to an itinerant preacher than to one who can surround himself with a body of sympathizing heretics. It tends to industry; for every preacher is called upon to give an account of his stewardship annually, and is dependent for success largely upon a general as well as a local reputation, and cannot afford to be idle. It tends to connectional power, which Protestant Christendom much needs.

For these reasons we are willing to forego the advantages of a few permanent pastorates—how few, indeed!—and, while other denominations work their machinery, will endeavor to work ours, believing that it is the gift of Providence, and designed to be mighty in spreading "scriptural holiness over these lands."

The Methodist Episcopal Church is a vitality. It is an organization, not an aggregation. Organizations must fight constantly for existence. The lower laws of nature are against them, and the higher laws prevail only by resisting the lower. There is more discussion of ecclesiastical government in the Methodist newspapers of a single month than there would be in ten years if their government were simply congregational. But so long as an organization is successful and provides for the comfort and good of its individual constituents, it will be likely to enjoy an *esprit du corps*, and, though constantly losing from its number many who are not in harmony with it, will secure efficiency and growth. If the Methodist Episcopal Church, highly organized as it is, did not lose from its fold many both ministers and members, it would be a strong

symptom of degeneracy! This we say without even a latent reproach toward any who leave. On the other hand, in the great sisterhood of evangelical denominations men should seek the machinery by which they can gain and accomplish the most good. It is probable that the Methodist Episcopal Church in America since its origin has introduced to the Christian profession nearly, if not quite, as many, both members and ministers, who have gone into other folds, as those who have remained under its own banner. It might tone down its doctrine and usages so as to retain nearly all its converts, but in such a case it would have proportionally less to retain! Also, it has now reached a condition when it begins to receive as well as to give. Union with such an organization ought not to be merely a matter of heredity or of accident. Those who wish to fight on the water join the navy; those who wish to fight on the land join the army. Let those who wish to join and work a strong connectional Church with an itinerant ministry join the Methodists, and those who want what they call a "settled ministry" certainly can find several folds exactly suited to their demands.

In no one fact does the remarkable vitality of the Methodist Episcopal Church exhibit itself more than in the original independence of and dissimilarity to the civil government of the nation. Careful observers of history perceive that it is impossible for two great powers to affect a people at the same time without becoming similar in spirit and form. When the Roman empire, under Constantine, embraced Christianity, it was necessary for one or both to yield, so that they could embody the wishes of the same people. Both yielded almost equally. The empire gave up its pagan customs, and the Church gave up its republicanism. James Bruce, D. C. L., well says in his work on "The Holy Empire*:" "Since the ecclesiastical organization could not be identical with the civil, it became its counterpart. Suddenly called from danger and ignominy to the seat of power, and finding her inexperience perplexed by a sphere of actions vast and varied, the Church was compelled to frame herself upon the model of the secular administration."

The historian seems here, all unconscious of the fact, to be

* Published by Macmillan & Co., London, 1821.

uttering a broader truth. History never repeats itself in phenomena, but continually repeats itself in principle. It is practically impossible for a Church to flourish without conforming itself in its government to the usages of the people. The prevalent Roman Catholic usages are inharmonious with republican interests, and therefore in a republic the more intensely Roman Catholic a man is the less patriotic is he, and the contrary. If civilization engenders republics—and we certainly believe it does—then Roman Catholicism must become weak, or modify its usages. If all the evangelical Protestants in the United States should unite in one ecclesiastical organization—a thing not at all improbable for the twentieth century—the government of the combined body will be strikingly analogous with the contemporary government of the nation, whatever that may be.

Till within ten years the Methodist Church was governed by its ministers. Many of them seldom, if ever, voted in political elections; not one in a thousand of them had any political training, and the Church could develop with comparative independence of the State. Now every General Conference has a large number of trained politicians. We use the word in its honorable sense, and protest against the debasement of the term. All of these men have participated in American political duties, in town, city, State, or national legislative bodies. Some are or have been judges of various grades, and some executive officers. They are all not only familar with the usages of a republic, but saturated with its spirit. Now, no man can be a republican in State, and a monarchist in Church. It is an inconceivable phenomenon—except as a *lusus naturæ*. And he is a very poor observer who does not see the effects of our civil training and character in the growing assimilation of our Church to our country. If any ask for evidence, we would refer them to the changes that have taken place in our forms of church trials, and to the reported systems of judicature recommended at the last General Conference.

Now, fortunately—perhaps, providentially—the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church has some general features strikingly similar to that of the American Republic. It is not Congregationalism. That is somewhat like what the secession-

ists would have desired had they been faithful to their principle of secession—a mere disunited agglomeration of States, counties, and townships, without federation, or so loosely federated as to have no general authority. To us it seems like liberty run mad. Presbyterianism is instinctively seeking an increase in its federative capacity, showing, what it has always manifested, a hearty sympathy with the American civil government. In America now the tide in State and Church is against secession, against disunion, against magnifying State rights, or the right of parts or sections, so as to make the great whole imbecile; and in favor of fraternity and of a strong government, exercised by men who shall be subject to law and strictly responsible. Our Church has a grand basis for the development of these principles. The nation is a wonderful system of wheels. A great three-rimmed wheel, legislative, judicial, executive, is the general Government; within that, about fifty smaller three-rimmed wheels, the States; within each of them, an indefinite number of solid-rimmed wheels, the counties; within each of these, several solid wheels, the townships—all moving by the same spirit and the same direction. It is the strongest government in the world, because the nature of the whole is in the germ—as of the oak or of the man—all its parts are homogeneous.

Similar is the complex unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. First, if we look at the outside, we have the twelve, more or less, bishops, somewhat like the justices of the Supreme Court, elected for life, and invested with a well-defined and strictly limited judicial, executive, and supervisory authority. No ecclesiastical officers above these bishops or judges seem to be necessary. Below them come the Annual Conferences, which have much, and probably ought to have more, independent power, like the American States; below them, the District Conferences, like the counties; below them, the Quarterly Conferences—townships or cities. All these should be imbued with one spirit. All should act in harmony, and should have a homogeneous nature.

We should not press a theory into extremes simply for rhetorical effect. Things that grow are better than things that are made. But as these two institutions, each about one hundred years old, mature together, on the same soil, they must

naturally become more and more alike. The State is, and ought to be more, republican. But still, though republican in central idea, the civil government has many appointed officers, and maintains itself by authority, and according to law. The judges, members of the cabinet, officers of the army and navy, and many others, are appointed, and must obey. There is a judicious admixture of elections and appointments, and the principle of elections should be admitted only just far enough in theory to prevent the Government from becoming autocratic, or beyond the prompt reach of popular opinion. So, in the Church, all the officers ought not to be elective. The same combination of popular and responsible dependence and authority should be sought. If the Church government needs greater popularization, it is certainly in the elementary institutions, nearest to the primal source of authority. The stewards might, with propriety, be elected by the membership who had attained the proper age. Class-leaders might be nominated by the preacher in charge, and confirmed by the Quarterly Conference. The Annual Conference might safely be allowed to designate the number of presiding elders' districts, within certain assigned limits. Trustees might be prohibited from mortgaging church property without the consent of the membership, to be obtained by a process that would be sure to secure deliberation, and a thorough understanding of the subject. The eligibility of women to some of these offices, and the establishment of other offices for women, might, with propriety, be clearly defined in our fundamental law. All these things are not suggested for the purpose of "tinkering the Discipline," as those say who seem incapable of learning any thing or forgetting any thing—but to provide for increased vitality and usefulness.

To bring this about the General Conference ought to be relieved of a great part of its ceremonial and perfunctory work. The amount of time wasted in bandying compliments and getting its business sifted and put into shape, is enormous; while the attention given to earnest deliberation is far too small. We have endeavored thus plainly to steer between the stupidity of conservatism and the noisy immaturity of radicalism, and to show that, while the great essential pillars of our Church economy are right, many of the smaller attach-

ments need great changes. This, if it is a fact, is gratifying, for it indicates at the same time both safety and prosperity. What needs many changes is not worth saving: what needs no changes is dead.

## Art. II.—MYSTICISM.

Never was there an age when what is true in Mysticism needed emphatic assertion more than it does to-day. The general drift of thought is antagonistic to the spiritual and the eternal. Science, and by this word is generally understood the material and economic province, absorbs in itself all thought and investigation, and thus proves a very Minotaur, consuming numberless noble souls. It seems taken for granted that there is no science of the spiritual, that philosophy is a delusion, and that religion, to say the best of it, is a weakness of noble minds.

If, then, all the work of philosophy in the past is not utterly valueless—if it is not a mere search after truth, and vain besides—if its march through the ages has not left behind it a Golgotha—if religion is not the invention of man—if its varied forms are not equally valueless and equally misleading—if, finally, God is not an empty dream of humanity—then it behooves us to set forth spiritual truth with the same persistent reiteration which they employ who behold in matter the beginning and the end of all research and of all science.

On the other hand, we may assert that the term science cannot be monopolized by physical research, or limited to results reached by alembic and microscope, or circumscribed by the domain of matter. There is a science of the invisible as well as of the visible, just as reliable, and, in its way, equally thorough. In truth, there is a science of faith, one, as Van Oosterzee declares, "of which the life of faith forms the source and root, or, if you will, the principle and starting-point." Still further he says, "The true Christian can come, by the way of a living faith in Christ, to a knowledge and certainty of God and divine things, which is, in its nature, second to no other." All knowledge ends in mystery, physical science like every other; and the advantage of a spiritual philosophy is, that it

carries up the loose threads of ultimate physical science into the hand of God, and thus gives an adequate solution of all these mysteries. Every branch of physical science comes to this *ultima Thule*, as Ulrici has so admirably shown in his "*Gott und die Natur*," and thus places in our hands the proof of the divine.

The spiritual world, then, is existent as really as the material, and has its laws, as inflexible as those which determine the motions of the heavenly bodies. In like manner, we must insist that religion has its *raison d'etre* as much as any other constant phenomenon of human history. The shallow view of the deistic period of the last century, which declared religion and the Church to be the work of priestcraft, is held no longer by those who have followed the course of philosophic thought.

Schleiermacher, in his matchless way, and the philosophers of Germany, have showed the world that religion, the State, and art are powers that be, and are "ordained of God." Even Comte provided for the religious nature of man. Feuerbach apotheosized humanity, and Fiske, in the wake of Strauss, makes an exposition of the religious sentiment, and chants "Nearer, my God, to thee," as a hymn of obedience to Cosmic Law.

The term Mysticism, it must be admitted, is in bad repute. Mystic is one of those vague epithets of reproach which men hurl at those they disapprove, while yet attaching no very definite meaning to the same. It has an evil sense as well as a good one, and, it must be confessed, the evil association is often most prominent to the mind when the term is used. The Germans have two terms applicable to the general subject, Mystik, expressive of approval, and Mysticismus, of disapproval. It would avoid much confusion if we had in the English language terms thus related and yet expressive of widely different phenomena. Since this is not the case, we must be content to speak of a true and a false Mysticism. Sack, in his "*Christliche Polemik*," makes the distinction just spoken of; for while Mysticismus is one form of separatism, Mystik he declares to be profoundly Christian. So, more definitely still, Nitzsch declares in his "System of Christian Doctrine," "that the religious man, the man of faith, is, as such, a Mystic, for he in whose consciousness God does not appear certainly does not feel God, nor can he know or honor him; but he who only

thinks him, without loving him and becoming pure in heart, cannot know him vitally; much less can he behold him spiritually who desires to see him with the outward sense. The inner life of religion is ever Mysticism."

In exact accordance, then, with these views, we hold most emphatically that a true Mysticism is a normal and a sublime form of human thought and feeling; that it is a nobler and a truer development than that level common sense so much extolled; that it gives free play to that sense of mystery which we cannot escape if we would; that it is grounded in a profounder philosophy even than those can offer who assume to scout it. Still more, a true Mysticism alone can satisfy the religious nature of man, and place him *en rapport* with things invisible and eternal. Religion deals with those verities which, though unseen, are the most real of all, and which are apprehended most completely by the true Mystic. The Scriptures are full of these mystical elements, for even Paul, the logician, constantly deals in them. But John is the true Mystic above all, the normal type of the profoundest religious thought and experience. The eagle is his symbol, soaring toward the sun of truth, in the words of the medieval hymn:

> "Quo nec vates nec propheta
> Evolavit altius."

Let us ask, in the first place, what is the objective point of Mysticism—what is the goal of the Mystic's search?

First and always it is God. It seeks to gain access to the divine in the most direct way. It yearns after communion with him who is the ground of all being, and the source of all life. Erdmann, the philosopher of Halle, classifies the Mystics as speculative, practical, and theosophic. But the determinant attribute of Mysticism after all is practical, and it is this life-interest which is the center of the whole. The speculative form, of which he makes Eckhart a representative, is equally practical; but, in addition, this form seeks to vindicate itself at the bar of reason. It desires to show that communion with God is the demand of the intellect, as well as of the heart. Ruysbroek, whom he presents as a representative of the practical form of Mysticism, is no more so really than Suso and Tauler, whom he locates in the first division. So the theosophic Mys-

tic, as he makes Bœhme to be, is fundamentally and of set purpose practical; but his form of statement is over-loaded with physical, and even alchemistic, modes of expression.

In every form, then, and in every age, Mysticism has been a search after God, or an attempt to frame what Bernard called an "itinerary of the soul to God." The same thing has been claimed for philosophy, but it cannot be asserted in the same sense. Philosophy, it is true, seeks to answer the great questions of freedom, immortality, and God; but Mysticism aims in its sublime flight directly and always at the divine. Even in its perverted forms the same assertion holds good. In the ecstasy of Plotinus and the intellectual intuition of Schelling, in the pantheistic reveries of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, and the scarcely less definite pantheism of Fichte's "Way to the Blessed Life," we trace the irrepressible instinct that leads the human soul up to its source.

Mysticism has ever been a reaction from formalism and dogmatism in religion. When Christian men have been reliant upon the letter, the Mystic has always exalted the Spirit. When the Church has been content with mere dogmatic statement and intellectual orthodoxy, the Mystic revival has come, to rehabilitate its spiritual life and send new streams of power along its arid channels.

Especially was this true in the Middle Ages. The Gothic cathedral of scholasticism rose in proportion and grace as the centuries passed away; its pinnacles and spires caught the sunlight far up in air, and we look upon the edifice with wonder to-day. But the windows were darkened, the clear-story had no openings toward heaven, and the altars lacked incense. Then came Mysticism with its immediacy, its inward light, and its ecstatic experiences. Faith was exalted above reason, experience above theology, vision above logic, and, in general, life above theory. Instead of the cathedral became the conventicle, without furniture and without adornment; but it was open to the sky, and crowded with worshipers in spirit and in truth. Like all reactions, it was excessive, and often destructive; but, on the whole, far more healthful in its excess of life than the stagnation which preceded it.

In fact, there were times preceding the Reformation when the true Church was with the Mystics, rather than with the

proud hierarchy which ever thrust the priest between the individual soul and Christ. Certainly, as Ullmann has so well shown, they were the reformers before the Reformation. Over against the objectivity of scholasticism they emphasized subjectivity; over against the priesthood they exalted the rights of the individual believer; over against the *opus operatum* they pointed to the ideal significance of the rites of the Church: in fine, they were the exponents of internalism, individuality, and liberty. They accomplished by internal development what the Reformation did by revolutionary acts.

Again, a hundred years after Luther, a new dogmatism began to reign in the Protestant Church, and a new scholasticism was introduced, careful only for orthodoxy, and neglectful of spiritual life. Then the shoemaker of Görlitz began to be the subject of illuminations, and to write out thoughts which even Hegel praises for their speculative depths. The exhortation of the magistrates, "to stick to his last," was all in vain; and so, amidst the rubbish of his mystical shop, quicksilver, sulphur, and the rest, shines the Aurora of a spiritual morning.

So, again, when England was slumbering in spiritual sloth, and the Established Church with its ministers had become faithless, and even practical skepticism reigned supreme, according to the testimony of such various authorities as Southey, Isaac Taylor, and Archbishop Manning, the Wesleyan Reformation came, the soberest, and so the truest, Mysticism of all.

Thus Mysticism is ever practical in motive and final cause, whatever may be the method pursued. The highest object of human thought, the eternal goal of human longing, the rest of the human spirit, God, is the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of the Mystic's search.

We may see, then, secondly, of what value the study of Mysticism is to us. Preger, in a new monograph upon this subject, writes:—

> The history of Mysticism is said to be only a clinic history, but mayhap all found here is not sickness: perhaps the German Mysticism in the Middle Ages is one of the great steps of development in the history of the religious and spiritual life of our people; and perhaps those are right who see in this one of the most

significant preparations for the German Reformation; perhaps those also who claim to have found in it the cradle of German philosophy.

So, also, Martensen, in his "Meister Eckhart," writes:—

> Christian Mysticism is not only a most significant form of piety, and the religious life a peculiar religious growth, rooting in the depths of the feeling and the heart, but it is at the same time a form of speculative theology. So far is Mysticism, according to its innermost nature, from being antagonistic to reason, that we claim for it rather an important place in the history of religious speculation itself.

That these estimates are not exaggerated may be seen in the fact that here is a tendency which ever emerges in the history of human thought and feeling. In some of its forms, either genuine or perverted, its representatives stand forth in almost every age. That which associates these men together, and which links men otherwise so diverse in all respects, must be a constant factor of humanity, must be grounded in our common nature, must be the outgrowth of an instinct, if you please, which characterizes man as such. As a study of human nature it demands our attention, if we would not be less cosmopolitan than the Roman Terence. Besides, a closer examination will discover to us great truths under paradoxical forms of expression, and the highest spiritual utterances, though it may be in a barbaric dress; in fine, food for the spiritual sustenance of the children of light—very pearls, which are ever trodden under the feet of the multitude. In Eckhart one may study Mysticism in its deepest forms. Whoever has compassed him has gained an insight into essential Mysticism. Martensen says of him: "He is in the circle of German Mystics the most prominent form, the master of the whole school, in whom Mysticism presents itself in its strongest originality." And yet the most competent authorities deny that the charge of pantheism, so often attached to him, is a just one. His pantheism is not in the thought which he would present, but simply in the form of expression as viewed in the light of modern thought. Eckhart, were he living in our day, would use more guarded expressions, and repudiate the charge of pantheism with indignation. Ruysbroek, who belongs to the same stand-point with Eckhart, Suso, and

Tauler, defines four classes of so-called Mystics, against whose principles he cannot express himself with too great indignation. The first class assert that they belong to the Divine Essence, and that they are superior to the Spirit of God; the second assert that they are divine by nature; the third declare themselves divine sons of God in the same sense as Christ was; while the fourth are nihilists, declaring that neither themselves nor God have any real existence. So we see that the lines were drawn then, and, closely as the expressions of these men trend upon pantheism, in our view they were yet not chargeable with it.

Let us look at some of the questionable statements of Master Eckhart, which, we are sure, can be vindicated as full of speculative truth, and the utterances of a deep Christian experience.

Much fault has been found with this utterance of his: "God in himself was not God—in the creature only hath he become God." We may grant that this is not strictly true, yet in Eckhart's design it is only a bold form of statement of the well-known distinction in theology, and which solves many perplexing questions regarding the attributes of God *per se*, and God in relation to the world. Eckhart is only emphasizing the thought that the divine seeks manifestation in the creature-world, and obeys the ethical imperative of love. This yearning of the divine after his creatures is surely rational, and scriptural, too, for Christ himself asserted "that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." It is really not as bold a statement as that of the Christian lady into whose heart the Scotch Dr. Brown dropped the relentless question: "Janet, what should you say if, after all he has done for you, God should let you drop into hell?"

The profound answer was: "E'en's he likes; if he does, he'll lose mair than I'll do."

He is charged with teaching the doctrine of emanation, as he uses the term. But he explains creation as an outflow of the creature mediated by the divine will.

He says, in various forms of expression, "The eye whereby I inwardly see God is the same eye whereby God inwardly sees me." But he is here speaking of the "spark," or *ganster*, of the soul, the uncreated essential reason, which is God within

us. In other cases this expression is to be explained by his theory of perception, according to which he would assert that the union of the thing perceived with the soul is so intimate that soul and thing become one. In fact, he says on one occasion, "Eye is wood, and wood is my eye." Surely, all want of distinction between the soul and God is denied, when he says in this immediate connection, "Soul is God, and God is soul, and, in the actuality of its seeing, God and soul persist in one essence. Still each remains what it is, although they become one in the actuality of seeing." One more quotation will suffice to vindicate Eckhart from the charge of pantheism. "How is it with the soul lost in God? May it find itself or not? And although it sinks and sinks in the eternity of the divine essence, it can yet never grasp the ground. Therefore has God left it a little point, whereby it returns into itself, and finds itself, and confesses itself creature." He says somewhere, "God and I are one in knowing;" a thought which Hegel has made his own, with all the consequences, in his "Philosophy of Religion." But what has already been said about perception will assure us that he does not mean it in the pantheistic sense. Besides, he is speaking from the heart of the scholastic premise that thought and being are one, as well as emphasizing, perhaps one-sidedly, the fact of the divine substrate of human thought and human personality. When he says, "The inner voice is the voice of God," we readily acquiesce; but when he passes from the ethical to the intellectual reciprocity of the human and the divine, we lag behind him.

When he says, "The heavenly Father produces his only-begotten Son in himself and in me—for I am one with him—he cannot exclude me," we shake our heads in disapproval. Yet as sober a theologian as Cudworth has the same thought of the Christian soul becoming a Christ, and it is not far to seek a Scripture analogue in "Christ in you."

The two great thoughts with which the Mystic deals are renunciation of self and obedience to God. These are confessed to be practical duties by the soberest Christian of to-day. Without the former we have not met the first condition of the Christian life, and opened the way to implicit obedience. "Then shall a man," says Eckhart, "be truly poor, when he is as free from his creature-will as he was before he was born.

He alone hath true spiritual poverty who wills nothing, knows nothing, desires nothing." It has sometimes been demanded of the Christian that his will should be so entirely acquiescent in the divine that he should consent to be damned, were it the will of God. It certainly is not an adequate mode of statement, and all of truth which it contains is expressed in Eckhart's account of the beggar.

"What if God were to cast thee into hell?" said the scholar.

"Cast me into hell? His goodness holds him back therefrom. Yet if he did, I should have two arms to embrace him withal. One arm is true humility, and therewith am I one with his holy humanity. And with the right arm of love, that joineth his holy Godhead, I would embrace him, so he must come with me into hell likewise. And even so, I would sooner be in hell and have God, than in heaven and not have him."

Suso, who has been called the Minnesinger of divine love, was wont to say—thus uniting in one formula the two elements of renunciation and obedience—"A man of true self-abandonment must be *un*built from the creature, *in*built with Christ, and *over*built into the Godhead."

Much has been said about the mystic trance—the ecstasies which sometimes overmaster the subject of divine illumination. Such experiences do not seem wholly unlikely or abnormal. An undue yearning for these spiritual delights is deprecated by the better class of Mystics; and Jeremy Taylor says, "It is not discretion in a servant to hasten to his meal and snatch at the refreshment of visions—unions and abstractions." Bernard of Clairvaux also seeks for peace, and joy, and charity to all men, and leaves "the high hills to the harts and the climbing goats." Still Henry More makes the fitting distinction when he writes, "To such enthusiasm as is but the triumph of the soul of man, inebriated, as it were, with the delicious sense of the divine life, that blessed Root and Original of all holy wisdom and virtue, I am as much a friend as I am to the vulgar, fanatical enthusiasm a professed enemy."

Surely if scientific discovery and the dawn of intellectual truth upon the soul have kindled raptures such as we know to be real, much more might it be reasonable to suppose that spiritual

truth and accomplished communion with God would thrill the inmost soul in a manner unknown on any lower plane. If Archimedes' Eureka, and Pythagoras's hecatomb are only faint expressions of intellectual joy; if Kepler cried out in rapture, "O God, I think thy thoughts after thee!" and Newton was unmanned by his discovery of universal gravitation, surely Suso's visions are not wholly incredible, nor Bœhme's two revelations, nor the Contemplation of the Victorines. They may be, and probably are, exaggerations; the spiritual equilibrium is not maintained, as might be expected; things are not viewed in "the dry light" of reason; but still we insist that these high experiences are not wholly delusion, and have their rational ground in the depths of the human soul.

Thirdly, Mysticism is far more to us than a study of one phase of human thought and feeling, or than a *stadium* of the philosophic development of mankind. It is a matter of the greatest practical interest to us—in fact, no other than this: May we know God and hold intimate personal communion with him? The yearning of the race after the divine and our misery without him show the practical issues of the question. It is the highest and deepest of all, compared with which all other investigations are of but little account. Whatever else Revelation is given to accomplish, the focus of Scripture truth is here.

Mysticism, then, brings us back to the conviction deeply rooted in the human soul, that God is accessible to us. It scouts the philosophy of Nescience, which Hamilton brought forward, and which Mansel pushed to the limits of absurdity. It scoffs at the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, certainly so far as regards God, and asserts adequate knowledge, though it be partial and finite. The Mystic laughs to scorn "The Limits of Religious Thought," and deems it, as it truly is, one of the most pernicious of books. If he must choose between the two, he would sooner take to his heart Hegel's "Philosophy of Religion." If the doctrine of relativity is to be accepted at all, it is to be taken as a truism, namely, we can know only so far as we have the capacity to know. Ulrici says in "Glauben und Wissen":—

The attribute conditioned, as applied to our knowledge, is *qualitative*, a peculiarity of our knowing, but by no means a quantitative

limitation of the same through another. Thus no real existence is excluded from our cognition, but every existent thing, without exception, may be known by us if it meets the conditions of our cognition.

Therefore, as consciousness is the *sine qua non* of perception in all other cases, it is no less so as regards the divine. Men may juggle as they will with the *ding an sich*, and deny our knowledge, since we cannot escape consciousness; it is, nevertheless, true that we do have real knowledge of the thing in perception, and of God, as of all else. Thus, as Maurice well says, "We cannot discover the Eternal and Infinite, but he discovers himself." The Divine Orb rises above the horizon of consciousness, illuminating the whole field, and giving knowledge of himself. Along with the self-consciousness and the world-consciousness, as the philosophers say, is a God-consciousness. This is of the nature of an instinct, or, rather, it is an intuition, capable of being crushed out, on the one hand, or of being developed, on the other. Thus this religious consciousness may become at last communion. Thus, too, on philosophic grounds, we may assert an elevated and immediate consciousness of God. The declaration of Paul, "In him we live, and move, and have our being," is the profoundest philosophic truth. The vision of God in Malebranche is not the exact truth, but infinitely nearer the same than that deistic transcendence which is so fearful of pantheism as to give no place to the sister truth of the divine Immanence. Paul asserts the same most definitely in saying, "He is not far from every one of us," and routs all the advocates of Nescience by declaring the search after God, the feeling after him, and the finding at last.

Turning now from these general considerations, which may be called philosophic, let us consider those which are specifically Christian. The postulate of Scripture, the thought which is ever prominent throughout the New Testament, is that of man's knowledge of God, and the possibility, yea, necessity, of communion with him. If Revelation is not to be vapored away into mere external truth, it is to be estimated after the words of Christ when he says, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." The words of Paul are to the same effect: "The things which God hath prepared for them that

love him, . . . God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit;" or, better still, the words of John: "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."

Of course, all this is true only of those who have met the conditions of Christian faith, and have entered into communion with God, even though it be in but an initial stage and a germinal experience. The proud, unbelieving world is excluded from such a knowledge by its self-maintained incapacity to receive it, as Paul tells us, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, . . . because they are spiritually discerned."

Now, all this is the central core of Mysticism. These are the thoughts in which the Mystic delights, and which he seeks to verify in his daily experience.

The lessons of Mysticism are lessons for this present time, because of our continual proneness to sink down to the plane of naturalism and worldliness, and forget the teachings of our divine Master. The great want of the Church to-day is a profounder apprehension of the basal truths of spiritual life, and a translation of the same into individual experience. The mass of Christians seem to hold the profounder truths of Scripture speculatively, and fail to apprehend their deepest meaning. They have some knowledge of God, but not an intimate and unintermittent communion. They take the utterances of the Saviour and of inspired men at a vast discount, often appropriating into their experience only the lowest potency of spiritual life. The declarations of Scripture and the great privileges there proclaimed must be taken up into our experience, and the test of use applied to them. They enunciate great facts of spiritual life. They are but a dead letter, unless we verify them in daily use. The Scriptures state spiritual facts to us as a scientific work states physical truth. They give us the conditions upon which their facts may be verified in personal experience, without which, indeed, they cannot be verified at all.

Now, the great mass of the Christian world does not, we think, verify spiritual truth in this manner. Hence the weakness of the Church, and the feeble life of believers; hence the failure of the Church to impress upon the world a conviction of the great doctrines of spiritual life which the Master has placed in its possession.

Let us turn to the Mysticism of John. "God is light;" and what other function has light than to reveal itself and all things upon which it falls? Still further, this light is not inaccessible, because it has been manifested in the human sphere through his Son; and, yet more, the end of man's existence is to have fellowship with this life and this light.

Now, this is not to be accomplished by purely intellectual processes. We can never get beyond ourselves by mere thought, though it be Titanic. Plotinus cannot teach us how we may reach God by his ecstasy, for the *ἄνθος νόου* does not bathe in the light of the divine; nor can Schelling lift us to the divine manifestation by his intellectual intuition, although in his Erlangen lectures he woos us to a renunciation that sounds strangely like the Christian. They give us but an *ignis-fatuus*, a creation of the imagination. The true mystical, the practical way, is the only way to climb to God. Love is the solvent word, and John speaks it when he says, "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God"; or, negatively, "he that loveth not, knoweth not God." The words of Pascal are familiar, "The things of this world must be known to be loved, but the things of God must be loved to be known." Plotinus claimed to have reached his serene height only twice in his life; and Schelling declares that such experience is not for the mass of men, but accorded only to the innermost circle of the initiated. The true Mystic, however, declares that the revelation of God to the soul of man through love and obedience is for all—equally for the peasant and the philosopher—yea, more frequently granted to the former than the latter, because he can more easily put himself in relation to the revealing God.

Thus the vision of God is to be gained from no intellectual Himmalaya; the philosopher may pile Ossa upon Pelion in vain: he cannot scale the heavenly heights. But to the loving soul God reveals himself. The glory of a conscious communion irradiates the soul. Rapture untold, and well nigh too much for mortal soul to bear, becomes at times its portion; as the Rabbins say that Moses died because of the kiss of God; and even in these prosaic modern days, Fletcher, of Madeley, cried out, "withhold thy hand, O God, lest the vessel burst."

The two imperative demands which Mysticism has always made are abnegation of self, and thus of sin—and then entire consecration to God. What else than this does Christianity demand of its disciples in every age? There is nothing in the Mystics that plows deeper into the soul than the words of Christ himself. Self, which is the fountain of sin, the tap-root of transgression, is struck at by that grand maxim with which the Sermon on the Mount begins, and which contains Christianity *in nuce:* "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

Another utterance of the Saviour which recalls the Mystic death of self is this: "Whoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

We know these statements are truisms in the Christian world, often on our tongues, and deemed axiomatic. But we do not fully believe them; we do not act as if they were literally true; we do not conduct our lives in accordance with their deep meaning. We come short of the fullness of Christian truth, and rarely verify it in our experience. Self is not slain; we do not ascend "dying-wise," as the Mystics say; or, again, make it our motto with others, "*introrsum ascendere*," and thus pave the way for entire consecration to God, whereby the Mystic "sets his feet in a large room." We aim at the gifts of God, rather than God himself, forgetting that with him we have all. A Kempis gives a conversation between the soul and Christ, in which Tholuck imitates him in his "Hours of Christian Devotion," wherein this lesson is taught to the believer.

Madam Guyon also sings:—

> "The love of thee flows just as much
> As that of ebbing self subsides;
> Our hearts, their scantiness is such,
> Bear not the conflict of two rival tides."

When the Christian reaches this point, he knows the full meaning of the Saviour's utterance: "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," for deliberation gives place to unquestioning obedience, and *formal* becomes *real* freedom.

In view of all this, it may be asserted that we need a Mystic revival in the Christian Church. There is no danger in

Mysticism, as long as it adheres to the word of God, and keeps from aberration thereby. The errors of Mysticism have always arisen from neglect of this chart, given to guide the mariner over the sea of life. If we cleave to revealed truth, we shall be saved from one-sided subjectivity and from a morbid introspection as well.

Lastly, the only hope of a union in the future of the severed members of the body of Christ, which is his Church, is to be found in a deeper, spiritual life in a mystic union with Christ. On the basis of dogmas and creeds we shall never come together; but when our hearts shall all beat responsive to the highest and deepest spiritual truth, when we shall all work harmoniously under the impulse of Christian love, when, in fine, the Mysticism of St. John shall take deep root in all the disciples of Christ, then the subduing power of divine love will draw us together, and the dissensions of Christendom will forever cease. It must be thus, for Mysticism seeks to live a life "hid with Christ, in God."

## ART. III.—SCHLIEMANN'S TROJAN RESEARCHES.

*Troy and its Remains;* A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries made on the Site of Ilium, and in the Trojan Plain. By Dr. HENRY SCHLIEMANN. Translated, with the Author's Sanction. Edited by PHILIP SMITH, B. A., Author of the "History of the Ancient World," and of the "Student's Ancient History of the East." With Map, Plans, Views, and Cuts, representing Five Hundred Objects of Antiquity Discovered on the Site. 8vo., pp. lv. and 392. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1876.

THE present century is certainly an age of archæological discovery unrivaled in its results by any preceding period of equal length. Indeed, it may be asserted without exaggeration that the fruits of the most recent investigations in this domain are not thrown into the shade by the brilliant successes attained in the realm of scientific research, or in that of useful invention. Had nothing more been accomplished than the reconstruction of a great part of the geography of the ancient world previously misunderstood, this would, in itself, have constituted a valuable acquisition. But this incidental gain is, in fact, of minor importance in comparison with the light that has been so copiously shed upon the manners and customs, the language, and

especially the history, of the men and women of remote generations. It is no small thing, by the uncovering of an ancient site, to be brought face to face with the civilization of two or three thousand years ago; still less is it an insignificant prize that is won, when the clew of the apparently indecipherable monumental records is obtained, and a riddle is solved that clears up the difficulties of alphabet and language, compelling inscribed slabs and bricks to give up the long-treasured secret of a forgotten history.

At what a prodigious expenditure of time, thought, and money these ends have been attained, we all know. The excavation of even a limited area, when the accumulated *débris* of centuries is twenty or more feet in depth, requires no slight outlay; and the extensive operations of Layard and Botta at Nineveh would not have been practicable without the substantial support obtained by the explorers from the British Museum and the French Government. It was reserved for the author of the work now before us to demonstrate what a more than princely liberality could enable a private person to accomplish in the work of discovering and laying bare to the inspection of the world an ancient city of great celebrity, that has been buried forty feet deep in the ground; and to do this by means of his own unaided resources. Leaving out of consideration the great achievements of pure benevolence, whether prompted by distinctly religious or by merely philanthropic motives, we must assign to such undertakings as that of Schliemann a place among the most praiseworthy of human efforts. They tend very greatly to enlarge the sphere of our acquaintance with the past, and they exhibit an unselfish desire to be of general utility which cannot be too highly commended. In an age tending strongly to an idolatrous exaltation of wealth into an object of adoration, he who practically manifests his own estimate of the transcendent value of knowledge in the comparison deserves well of his fellows, not only for the immediate good he does, but for the wholesome example he sets to the world.

However little many of the learned may like it, a prominent teaching of the course of recent discoveries is that incredulity is not the highest intellectual exercise, and that, after all, *faith*, even in purely secular matters, will be more likely to attain to

truth than its opposite. History undeniably has its difficulties, which a destructive criticism would summarily dispose of by impugning without hesitation the good faith or the intelligence of those upon whose authority its statements rest. But the stern logic of archæological discovery convicts the rash act as one of supreme folly, and removes much of what had been consigned to the category of impossibility, to the ever-increasing number of historical paradoxes. The discovery of the traces of Xerxes' canal across the isthmus of Mt. Athos no more directly exposes the ignorance of the Roman satirist who sneered at the reputed achievement as a "Greek lie," than does the recovery of the tablets in cuneiform character, giving an early Assyrian tradition of the Deluge, demonstrate the silliness of the erudite critic who adduces a great mass of learning to prove the writer of the Pentateuch a forger flourishing long after the Babylonish Captivity.

Of the wonderful vitality and efficacy of faith in purely secular relations the volume whose title stands at the head of this article, and which has now been sufficiently long before the public to receive careful consideration, is a standing proof. Whatever Heinrich Schliemann has accomplished at Troy has been directly, we had almost said *solely*, the result of a conviction which no skepticism, however plausible or backed by pretended scholarship, could shake, that Homer was a real person, that Troy was a veritable city, that the expedition of the Greeks under Agamemnon actually took place, and that in the Iliad we have a fair and authentic account of some of the incidents of the expedition, not, indeed, without some poetical exaggeration and embellishment, but, nevertheless, in its essential points honest and trustworthy. For, to use his own words, the fortunate explorer approached his self-imposed task believing in the exactness of the Iliad as in the Gospel itself! *

Under the circumstances, it becomes a matter of no common interest to learn something of the personal history of the man himself, who, without this strongly developed characteristic, could hardly have gained the results he has reached. Happily, he has given us a brief autobiographical sketch, worthy of attention on more accounts than one.

We should not be far wrong if we classed Heinrich Schlie-

* "Troy and its Remains," p. 17.

mann's life itself among the paradoxes of history; for nothing could have been further from ordinary human probability than that the boy of fourteen, apprenticed to a grocer in the insignificant town of Fürstenberg, in the province of Mecklenburg, should ever figure as in some regards the foremost discoverer of our times, and one of the most remarkable linguists, if not for accuracy, at least for the rapidity in which he has mastered a very large number of languages. Schliemann first introduces himself to our notice—and the incident is not so trivial as it at first appears to be—as a boy of ten years of age, in 1832, presenting to his father, then living in the village of Kalkhorst, as a Christmas gift, what he styles a badly written Latin essay upon the principal events of the Trojan war, and the adventures of Ulysses and Agamemnon. "Little did I think," he adds, with a touch of pardonable self-gratulation, "that six-and-thirty years later I should offer the public a work on the same subject, after having had the good fortune to see with my own eyes the scene of that war, and the country of the heroes whose names have been immortalized by Homer." The sentence was written more than nine years ago, on the last day of 1868, and long before his explorations at Troy had revealed what Schliemann confidently believes to be the very city Homer celebrated in song, or we may be sure that it would have had a still more pointed conclusion.

No surroundings could well have been more unfavorable to mental culture than those by which young Schliemann was now environed. From five in the morning to eleven at night his occupations were "retailing herrings, butter, brandy, milk, and salt, grinding potatoes for the still, sweeping the shop, etc." He was brought into contact only with the poor and ignorant; he had not a moment free for study, and he rapidly forgot the little he had learned in childhood. But he did not forget how his father had enchanted and transported him with enthusiasm by relating to him, as soon as he had learned to speak, the great deeds of the Homeric heroes. An incident that occurred during this dreary period is so characteristic that we must reproduce it in his own words:—

As long as I live I shall never forget the evening when a drunken miller came into the shop. He was the son of a Protestant clergyman in a village near Teterow, and had almost con-

cluded his studies at the Gymnasium when he was expelled on account of his bad conduct. To punish him for this his father made him learn the trade of a miller. Dissatisfied with his lot, the young man gave himself up to drink, which, however, had not made him forget his Homer; for he recited to us about one hundred lines of the poet, observing the rhythmic cadence. Although I did not understand a word, the melodious speech made a deep impression upon me, and I wept bitter tears for my unhappy fate. Then I got him to repeat to me those god-like verses, paying him with three glasses of brandy, which I bought with the few pence that made up my whole fortune. From that moment I never ceased to pray God that by his grace I might yet have the happiness to learn Greek.

So enthusiastic a nature could scarcely be repressed; but it was one of those providential circumstances that at first sight appear either unimportant, or positively disadvantageous, that led the way to the fulfillment of the lad's hopes. Overstraining his chest in lifting a heavy cask, he spat blood, and was unfitted for his hard work. Almost in despair, he shipped at Hamburg as cabin-boy on a vessel bound for Venezuela, was shipwrecked off the island of Texel, near the Zuyder Zee, whence, with difficulty, he made his way to Amsterdam. Here the sympathy of a kind ship-broker secured him a small subscription to meet his immediate wants, and a situation in an office, where his work consisted in stamping bills of exchange and getting them cashed in the town, and in carrying letters to and from the post-office. The compensation was pitifully small; the youth shivered in his wretched garret by winter, and was scorched by the heat in summer; while for his meals he could afford so little that his breakfasts were of rye-meal porridge, and his dinner never cost more than three cents of our money. But he had time to study! He began with English, and his efforts were pursued with extraordinary diligence. As the methods of a man who has accomplished such linguistic success are entitled to a careful examination, we shall let him state them for himself:—

Necessity showed me a method which greatly facilitates the study of a language. This method consists in reading a great deal aloud, without making a translation, devoting one hour every day to writing essays upon subjects that interest one, correcting these under a teacher's supervision, learning them by heart, and repeating in the next lesson what was corrected on the previous day. My memory was bad, since from my childhood it had not

been exercised upon any object; but I made use of every moment, and even stole time for study. I never went on my errands, even in the rain, without having my book in my hand, and learning something by heart; and I never waited at the post-office without reading. By such means I gradually strengthened my memory, and in half a year I had succeeded in acquiring a thorough knowledge of the English language. I then applied the same method to the study of French, the difficulties of which I overcame likewise in another six months. These persevering and excessive studies had in the course of one year strengthened my memory to such a degree that the study of Dutch, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese appeared very easy, and it did not take me more than six weeks to write each of these languages, and to speak them fluently.

Schliemann's next work was the mastering of the Russian language in the course of six weeks, with the aid of "an old grammar, a lexicon, and a bad translation of Telemachus." This last acquisition he put to good practical account; for from writing commercial letters in Russian, and conversing with the Russian merchants who resorted to Amsterdam for the indigo auctions, he came to be dispatched to St. Petersburg as agent for a Dutch house, and in about a year more established himself there in business for himself. He does not tell us much respecting his commercial success, except that he retired in 1863, having, by the blessing of Heaven, accumulated a fortune such as his ambition had never ventured to aspire to—a fortune, we may add, without which it would have been impossible for him to prosecute the excavations which have made his name famous.

It was not until January, 1856, that he ventured to commence the study of Greek, the reason of this strange delay being that he was afraid that this language "would exercise too great a fascination" over him, and "estrange him from his commercial business!" Nobly, however, did he make up for lost time. In six weeks he overcame the difficulties of modern Greek; in three months more he could read Homer; and during the ensuing two years, devoted exclusively to Greek literature, he read "almost all the old authors cursorily, and the Iliad and Odyssey several times." In 1858–59, he traveled extensively through Europe, Egypt, and Syria, returning by Athens. In 1864–66, he "allowed himself to be persuaded" to visit India, China, and Japan, and travel around the world. In 1870 he

made some preliminary excavations at Hissarlik, and convinced himself that the true site of Troy was to be found there. The results of this examination, which were meager, were published in French, in a work entitled "Ithaque, le Péloponnèse, et Troie." His more systematic excavations were prosecuted in 1871–73, and it is the important fruits of these three years' labors that are given to us in detail in the volume before us.

We have given these details of Dr. Schliemann's life, based upon his own account, because that account, in its simplicity, naturalness, and enthusiasm, is a reflection of the man himself. For, perhaps as much as any writer whose productions we have ever read, Schliemann, in portraying the subject of which he treats, brings his own personality distinctly to the reader's eye. We see before us a character by no means common. We admire in it the great development of the perceptive faculties. As in the acquisition of a foreign language, so in the development of a theory, we find in Schliemann great rapidity of action and a facile comprehension. Before the untiring zeal of the scholar and explorer all difficulties, whether material or intellectual, seem to vanish, and nothing like failure can be admitted. At a touch, as in some Eastern fable, every thing turns to gold. Courage, perseverance, determination, are never wanting. With these there is entire good faith, and an honesty that has never a thought of concealment, even when worldly wisdom might dictate a little prudent reserve.

It cannot be denied, we add in passing, that these advantages are counterbalanced by some serious defects. Schliemann is undoubtedly apt to jump at conclusions, especially when these go to support his pre-conceived notions, and to announce conclusions thus hastily and inconsiderately reached with the positiveness of certain knowledge. His ardent faith, also, has at times a tendency to degenerate into a species of credulity; and with a fickleness often found closely associated with too great haste and positiveness of deduction, it is no uncommon thing for him to abandon very unceremoniously a point which at an earlier period he had not even deigned to support by demonstration, but was quite content to assume as an axiom demanding no proof. Without, however, dwelling longer upon the man, we pass to a consideration of a few of the interesting and important results he has reached.

The excavations of Schliemann have fully confirmed the belief of the most judicious of moderns, as well as the almost unanimous faith of antiquity, that the site of the Homeric Troy was to be sought on the hill known at present as *Hissarlik*, (that is, in Turkish, "the fortress,") between the villages of Kum-kioi, Kalli-fatli, and Tchiblah. Into the history of the dispute respecting the site of Troy we need not enter at any great length. It is not disputed that the Ilium of historical Greek times, the Ilium of the fourth century before Christ, was Hissarlik. Here was a city inhabited by a population Greek in language, and Greek by descent, who claimed to occupy the very inclosure within which Priam's palace once stood. There is no doubt that it was upon the "Pergamus" shown in that city that Xerxes, when starting on his expedition against Greece, endeavored to propitiate the Ilian Minerva by an offering of a thousand cattle, and by libations poured out by the Magi in honor of the local heroes. (Herodotus, vii, 43.) The site may not have been at that time peopled, as it certainly was peopled at the time of the expedition of the younger Cyrus, and in that of Alexander the Great, who visited it when starting on his great march to the East. Nor was the correctness of the identification of the Old and New Iliums ever seriously called into question until Demetrius, of Skepsis, and Hestiæa, a female author of Alexandria Troas, advanced the startling view that the whole world had hitherto been laboring under a mistake. How far local jealousies may have occasioned their violent opposition to the universally received notion we do not know; but ostensibly their grounds were found in the impossibility of compressing all the stirring events of the Trojan war, as recounted by Homer, into the contracted plain between the Ilium of historic times and the shore of the Hellespont. For this shore, they urged, had once been much nearer the walls, the alluvial soil brought down by the river Scamander having greatly encroached upon the waters.

The skeptical views of Demetrius and Hestiæa were indorsed by Strabo, (who, however, never visited the localities,) and, among moderns, toward the end of the last century, by Lechevalier, who has had a large following. These views necessitated the selection of some other spot to be invested with the honors of which Hissarlik, the "new" Troy, was to be

stripped. There were two favorite localities: the so-called "Village of the Ilians"—Ἰλιέων κώμη—and the heights of *Bounarbashi*, both of them much more distant from the shore, and, therefore, affording an ample (in fact, *too* ample) space for the Homeric combats. The first of these two sites was, however, rejected by almost all careful critics, and the learned of the beginning of the present century had so decidedly agreed upon the other that Colonel Leake, usually so careful an authority, remarked apologetically at the outset of his discussion of the matter in his "Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor," published in 1824:—

> So many of the most intelligent *travelers* in the Troas are agreed in placing the Homeric Ilium at Bounarbashi that I should have been satisfied on the present occasion with stating my concurrence with their opinion, and with referring to the arguments of such of them as have supported it by their publications, had not some adverse systems been recently maintained with great learning and ingenuity; though chiefly, it must be admitted, by those who have considered the question in the closet only.—Page 277.

In defense of the more distant site the eminent geographer just referred to accordingly attempts to answer the most prominent objections that present themselves to every mind—such as, that the Greek and Trojan armies could not possibly have traveled over so many miles each day to and fro as this supposition would require, and that the pursuit of Hector by his victorious antagonist, Achilles, three times around the walls, would have been out of the question, in view of the peculiar conformation of the ground. The latter difficulty he meets by trying to show that Homer's language may be naturally understood to mean *near* or *before* the city, and not *around* it, * and that "no supposed situation of the city which is not entirely in the plain will suit the idea of a course around the entire circuit of the walls and that such a situation would be totally unadapted to the description which Homer has given to Troy, as windy, lofty, and as surmounted with a citadel bordered by precipices." Respecting the other objection, Colonel Leake, in the end, falls back upon the license which every poet feels entitled to use, and those fictions so frequently allowed

* By a comparison of the following lines of the Iliad: ii, 508; vi, 327; xvi, 448; xviii, 279.

throughout the Iliad that a particular reference to them "cannot be necessary." "At one time the poet found it convenient to magnify beyond probability, or, even beyond possibility, the common occurrences of war; at another, to bring together the actions of an extensive field, in order to present them to view in one continued scene."

Did it not occur to Leake, and to others of the same school, that in allowing Homer this latitude they were, in reality, taking away the force of every argument they could allege against the site of Hissarlik, derived from its too great proximity to the sea?

Mr. Grote, in his magnificent history,* and Leonhard Schmitz, in a short but sensible article in Dr. Wm. Smith's "Dictionary of Geography," refused to subscribe to the theory of Demetrius of Skepsis. But it was Schliemann who first put it to a practical test and proved it utterly untenable. He began by instituting excavations on the hill of Bounarbashi, and soon satisfied himself that no town could, at any time, have stood there. Every-where "the pure virgin soil" was met "at a depth of less than five feet, and, generally, immediately below the surface." Now, it is well known that the marks of the existence of an ancient inhabited town are altogether indelible. Even if the walls were not of stone, but, as in many cases, of sun-dried bricks, which easily crumble away, and become indistinguishable from the ordinary soil, the utensils of every-day life cannot be so thoroughly made away with as to leave no trace. Especially are the terra-cotta jars and vases, employed for a thousand purposes for which wood or metals are used among us—as amphoræ for wines and other liquids, in place of barrels, or huge earthenware casks of five or six feet in height, answering the purpose of cellars for the preservation of grain or oil—practically indestructible. Either entire or in pieces they are sure to remain. But there was nothing of the kind at Bounarbashi. On the heights back of the village the native rock was nowhere concealed by over a foot and a half of soil. Half an hour further inland there were, indeed, found traces of a small town, (probably Gergis;) but not only was the accumulation of *débris* altogether insignificant, but whatever pottery was found evidently belonged to the Hellenic

* Vol. i, page 328, and following. American Edition.

period. Schliemann was even more unsuccessful in November, 1871, on the site of the so-called "Village of the Ilians," where "nothing but pure granulated earth was found, without any admixture of ruins."*

Results more diverse from these could scarcely be conceived than followed close upon excavations on the despised *Hissarlik*. The difficulty was not to find, but to manage, the enormous deposits of relics of human habitations. Instead of meeting the native rock at the depth of one or two feet, Schliemann had to dig through a layer generally forty or forty-five, and sometimes even over fifty, feet in thickness. And in place of a uniform, earthy, or sandy deposit, there was a succession of deposits, often compacted to the hardness of rock, and diversified by a series of massive constructions, city walls and walls of private or public edifices, evidently built at different times and by people of various stages of civilization, one overlying the other in perplexing confusion. Schliemann discovered, therefore, that for *one* city he was in quest of, he had fallen upon the remains of not less than *four* cities, built one over the other! They are thus described by him. Referring to the upright position of the colossal urns found by him in several of the strata, Schliemann observes that this

> Is the best proof, if, indeed, any were needed, that the mighty masses of *débris* cannot have been brought here from another place, but that they were formed gradually in the course of thousands of years, and that the conquerors and destroyers of Ilium, or, at least, the new settlers after its conquest and destruction, never had the same manners and customs as their predecessors. Consequently, for many centuries houses with walls built of unburnt bricks stood upon the mighty heaps of stone, from thirteen to twenty feet thick, belonging to the enormous buildings of the primitive Trojans; again, for centuries houses built of stone joined with clay were erected upon the ruins of houses of brick; for another long period, upon the ruins of these stone houses wooden houses were erected; and, lastly, upon the charred ruins of the latter were established the buildings of the Greek colony, which at first consisted of large hewn stones joined with clay and cement. It can thus no longer seem astonishing that these masses of ruins, covering the primary soil, have a thickness of from fourteen to sixteen meters (forty-six to fifty-two feet) at the least.†

Which of these four pre-Hellenic cities was the Ilium of Priam and Hector, the Troy which the wonderful genius of

* "Troy and its Remains," pp. 42–44. † *Ibid.*, p. 175.

Homer has made more famous and interesting to us than a hundred other cities once equally powerful, but now wholly lost in obscurity? On this point Schliemann has, at different times, held different opinions. At first he was decidedly inclined to identify it with the city whose ruins formed the lowest stratum. Subsequently he as decidedly rejected his first impressions, and came to the conclusion that this honor was due to the city next in order of time. And, certainly, if Homeric Troy stood on this spot—and not another site within any reasonable distance can be shown to possess any of the requisite conditions—it would seem that the second layer combines more features that resemble it than either its predecessor or its two successors. Unless Schliemann has grossly misunderstood the indications of the levels, it was with the second city that those fortifications arose in which are prominent what he believes to be the Great Tower of Ilium, and the double entrance alone exhibiting any correspondence to the Scæan Gates.

In this connection we may mention one or two circumstances incidentally touched upon by the author, to us scarcely inferior in interest to the main subject of discussion. Every one knows how much geologists and others have made of the data for chronology furnished by the relative thickness of deposits made in historic times. If the alluvial sediment forming at the mouths of some rivers within the recollection of man has been measured and found to increase at the slow rate of a few inches or feet in a century, it is inferred that the rock strata, apparently of similar formation, and measuring many hundreds of feet in thickness, must have required hundreds of thousands of years. And if the falls of Niagara are discovered to be gradually receding westward a very few feet in a decade of years, through the slow but steady crumbling of the rocks over which they pour, the same authorities jump at the conclusion that it must have taken thirty-five thousand*—possibly, suggests Dana, three hundred and eighty thousand†—years for the Niagara River to wear away its gorge of eight and a half miles in length. The same reasoning has been applied to places of human habitation. But Schliemann's practical experience proves it in this case perfectly fallacious, and he comes

* Lyell's "Principles of Geology," p. 217. † Dana, "Text-book," pp. 245, 6.

to this conclusion respecting the cities on the hill of Hissarlik—certainly a conclusion far from being foreseen by him at first—that "*it is impossible to calculate the duration of their existence, even approximately, from the thickness of their ruins.*"* The grounds of the assertion are clear and definite.

We do not know the conditions under which these ruins were found. "We can form no idea of the way in which these nations lived, and what calamities they had to endure." Starting with the facts, which he believes that we have sufficient reason to accredit, that the *Greek* city—the Ilium Novum—was founded about 700 B. C., and continued to be inhabited until about 361 A. D., Schliemann asks himself the question, "How many centuries have been required to form a layer of *débris* forty and even forty-six and a half feet thick, from the ruins of pre-Hellenic houses, if the formation of the uppermost one, the Greek layer of six and a half feet thick, required one thousand and sixty-one years?" This question he admits to be incapable of present solution, when he replies, "During my three years' excavations in the depths of Troy I have had daily and hourly opportunities of convincing myself that, from the standard of our own or of the ancient Greek mode of life, we can form no idea of the life and doings of the four nations which successively inhabited the hill before the time of the Greek settlement."†

Equally interesting is the circumstance that Schliemann's discoveries at Troy upset the theory that *civilization* is a trustworthy index of age. So far from successive ages being clearly marked off by means of the presence of stone, copper, and iron implements, we have his testimony to the effect not only that "weapons and implements of pure copper were employed contemporaneously with enormous quantities of stone weapons and implements,"‡ but that they concur in all the four strata! The metals appear as early as the lowest stratum, several copper nails from four to six and a half inches in length being unearthed at a depth of fifty-two and a half feet.§ And, on the other hand, articles of stone are among the relics of the most recent stratum; just as in an instance quoted by the editor in the preface from the "Academy," January 9, 1875,

* Introduction, p. 14.
† *Ibid.*, *ubi supra.*
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
§ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

"a mound recently opened at the Bocenos, near Carnac, (in the Morbihan, France,) has disclosed the remains of a Gallic house of the *second century* of our era, in which *flint implements* were found, intermixed with pottery of various styles, from the most primitive to the finest examples of native Gallic art, and among all these objects was a terra-cotta head of the *Venus Anadyomene*." "Such facts as these," sensibly remarks Mr. Philip Smith, "furnish a caution against the too hasty application of the theory of the Ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron." We only need add Schliemann's own observation:

> It has been hitherto thought that the occurrence of stone implements indicates the "Age of Stone." My excavations here in Troy, however, prove this opinion to be completely erroneous; for I very frequently find implements of stone even immediately below the *débris* belonging to the Greek colony, that is, at the depth of six and a half feet, and they occur in very great quantities, from a depth of thirteen feet downward. Those, however, in the Trojan stratum, from twenty-three to thirty-three feet below the surface, are in general of much better workmanship than those above.—Page 21.

This last remark calls attention to another striking fact, namely, that, instead of regular progress, the deposits at Troy bear witness to a *steady decadence*. If this were true only of the stone implements, it might naturally be accounted for by the diminishing importance and growing disuse of these in comparison with implements of metal. But it holds good of every thing else. It is the case particularly with the pottery. That of the stratum resting on the primitive soil and rock is described as far superior to that found immediately above it, and from this there is a gradual but sure decline, both in excellence of material and ornamentation.* In other words, there is nothing whatever pointing to a slow development from the savage state to higher cultivation. On the contrary, in Troy, as in many other places, it is the old that is best. Man and his works alike seem to degenerate; so that, although in utensils now fashioned in the immediate vicinity of Troy we are able to recognize many an old type—so constant are the forms even of the simplest articles—it is matter of proof that for at least thirty centuries the execution has been uninterruptedly becoming worse and worse.

* Compare pp. 14, 25, 27, 47, 170, etc.

To a majority of readers, perhaps, the smallness of the surface included within the walls still extant on the hill of Hissarlik will, at first, seem an insurmountable obstacle in the identification of the site with the "great" city, which for ten long years sustained a siege against the assembled forces of Greece. It was Schliemann's original impression that the *hill* was the *Pergamus*, or citadel, while the city extended in the plain below, and was many times as extensive. The results of his tentative excavations in various parts of the ground at the foot of the hill failed to corroborate the supposition. At length he saw himself unwillingly compelled to take up with the conclusion that city and Pergamus were one and the same thing. But this was to admit that Troy, at its greatest size, occupied a space only a little larger than the Acropolis of Athens. Now, this latter measures not more than one thousand feet in length by five hundred in extreme width; and on this contracted plateau, of about three and a half acres, not more than five thousand inhabitants could well have been crowded! To say that Schliemann was intensely disappointed at this result is only to repeat what he has himself admitted. His sober second thought, however, led him to notice that the poet's words do not require us to conceive of Troy as what would now pass for a great city; not to say that the poetic license of magnifying whatever he treats of must never be forgotten. Mr. Gladstone ("Homeric Synchronism," p. 38) has entered into a calculation to show that even this insignificant number may suit the requirements of the Iliad. He thinks that the Greek host was more likely to have been fifty thousand than one hundred and twenty thousand strong, as generally supposed, and he aptly cites the one hundred and twenty-eighth line of the second book to prove that Homer regarded the Trojans proper, inhabitants of the city, as much less than *one tenth* as numerous as the invading enemy:—

πολλαί κεν δεκάδες δενοίατο οἰνοχόοιο.

"Should Greeks and Trojans make
A treaty, faithfully to number each,
And should the Trojans count their citizens,
And we the Greeks, disposed in rows of tens,
Should call the Trojans singly to pour out
The wine for us, full many a company

> Of ten would lack its cup-bearer; so far,
> I judge, the sons of Greece outnumber those
> Who dwell in Troy."*

It was, consequently, the allies "from many a city," as Agamemnon went on to say, that had enabled the Trojans for nine years to baffle all attempts to capture the city. And Troy itself might well rank with other primeval cities, whose celebrity is altogether incommensurate with their extent. That it was rich, and the center of a powerful state or confederacy, is sufficiently indicated by the gold and other precious material discovered almost by accident in June, 1873, just before the final suspension of Schliemann's researches, and to which, with his usual realistic tendency, he gives the designation of the "Treasure of Priam." If this had been all the treasure the princely house possessed, it might, nevertheless, have ranked among the wealthy families of an age when gold, silver, and copper were much less common than at present. But there is every reason to believe that the "Treasure" was only an insignificant fraction of the wealth of the captured city. Vastly greater hoards must have been pillaged and carried off by the Greeks, and it is only to the accidental circumstance that the flames of the burning city surprised the bearers of this store, and compelled them to abandon their burden, that we owe its preservation. The various articles bear evidence of the great heat to which they have been subjected, and some are actually welded together.†

Among the positions of minor importance assumed by Dr. Schliemann is one of considerable interest to scholars respecting the epithet γλαυκῶπις, so constantly applied, both in the Iliad and in the Odyssey, to the goddess Athena, or Minerva. It is well known that the exact explanation of the word has long been matter of doubt. The definition of Hedericus and Ernesti, "*cæsios* habens oculos, vel truces, adspectu terribiles, formidinem injicientes, cujusmodi sunt oculi noctuæ, quæ avis Minervæ erat consecrata," has been unpopular of late, because based upon a definition of γλαυκός ("glaucus, cæsius, cœruleus") for which, it is alleged, no authority can be found back of the second century before Christ. It is true, that the only time Homer used the word γλαυκός it is as an epithet of the *sea*,

* Bryant. † "Troy and its Remains," pp. 322–340, and plates.

and in this case certainly the term "blue" is sufficiently appropriate; though Mr. Bryant prefers to translate it "green." Patroclus says, reproachfully, to Achilles:—

γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα,
πέτραι δ' ἠλίβατοι· ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής.—Iliad, xvi, 35, 36.

"Whom wilt thou hereafter aid,
If now thou rescue not the perishing Greeks?
O merciless! it cannot surely be
That Peleus was thy father, or the queen
Thetis thy mother! the *green sea* instead
And rugged precipices brought thee forth,
For savage is thy heart." (Verses 44–46.)

But Empedocles, writing about the middle of the fifth century, in a didactic poem which we possess only in a fragmentary condition, but the genuineness of which, as Prof. Brandis, of Bonn, well observes, is attested beyond all doubt by the authority of Aristotle and other ancient writers, applies the same epithet, γλαυκή, to the *moon*, which could scarcely, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as either "green" or "blue!" Consequently, the view has been more generally adopted at present that the true signification is "bright," "gleaming," or "silvery;" and that the compound γλαυκῶπις indicates the brilliant, piercing glances of the lively, intellectual Minerva, the embodiment of keen-sighted intelligence.

In this view Schliemann does not acquiesce; for he thinks that he has discovered proof in his excavations of quite a different conception of this deity. In short, he fancies that the epithet γλαυκῶπις, applied to Athena, and the corresponding βοῶπις, applied to Hera, or Juno, point to a stage of religious belief far back in the past—a period when idolatry was more gross, and when, not contented with worshiping the deity by means of images bearing resemblance to the human form, the devotee bowed down to more unsightly stocks and stones. We know that, even in the palmy days of Assyrian civilization, such creations of the misguided ingenuity of men were held in reverence. The explorer of the ruins of Nineveh was startled in one place by finding colossal human-headed lions or bulls guarding a portal, or bass-reliefs of the fish-god (Dagon) adorning the walls, on which the deity was represented with the scales, fins, and tail of a fish, but yet with a man's head. (Compare

plates on pages 294 and 301 of Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon.") At another spot he found the arrangement reversed. Some god (possibly Nisroch) was portrayed with a human body surmounted with the head of an eagle, (*Ibid.*, page 543.) May not such idols have been the objects of early Greek devotion? We dare not affirm it, and are not, therefore, prepared as yet to indorse Schliemann's theory. There is, however, much that renders the theory far from improbable. Assuredly there is nothing in it to justify the ridicule so lavishly poured on it when first promulgated. There can be no doubt that the Greek religion underwent a great change in the course of ages. Whether the change was morally for the better may well be questioned. For it will be admitted that public morality gained little when the most revered of gods began to be represented nude, or when the chisel of Praxiteles fashioned his Aphrodite after the model of the notorious hetæræ of his day, (C. O. Müller, "Ancient Art and its Remains," 99.) But, in an artistic point of view, the gain was sensible. The gap was great between the rude, misshapen olive-wood statue of Athena, kept so religiously in the Erechtheum, because believed to have fallen down from heaven, (Pausanias, 1, 26, 7,) and the masterpiece of Phidias, in gold and ivory, gracing the interior of the neighboring Parthenon. If the latter had to be covered at night and in tempestuous weather, to protect it from the effect of the air and moisture, the former needed to be screened from too narrow inspection, and to be decked out with paint and ornaments. These early representations of the gods, in fact, to use Müller's words, "in their whole character had decidedly more resemblance to puppets than to works of cultivated plastic art;" "they were washed, polished, painted, clothed, and had their hair dressed; they were decorated with crowns and diadems, necklaces and ear-pendants; they had their wardrobe and toilet," (*Ibid.*, 38.) But back of these rude statues there were still other and more uncouth objects of devotion of an earlier age, in which no attempt was made to portray the Deity, but only to represent him by a "symbolic sign of his presence," (*Ibid.*, 35.) For this purpose were employed rough stones, stone pillars, wooden stakes. May it not have been that, intermediate between these and the earliest attempts at portraiture under a complete human form, images were made use of,

at first in the likeness of animals, symbolizing knowledge, forethought, power, etc., and afterward retaining only the head of these animals—so much, that is to say, as sufficed to connect them with the earlier representations?

To whatever conclusion we may be inclined to come, here are the facts of Dr. Schliemann's discoveries at Troy, as stated by himself, and the inference he draws:—

At all depths from three meters (ten feet) below the surface we find a number of flat idols of very fine marble; upon many of them is the owl's face and a female girdle with dots; upon one there are in addition two female breasts. The striking resemblance of these owls' faces to those upon many of the vases and covers, with a kind of helmet on the owl's head, makes me firmly convinced that all of the idols, and all of the helmeted owls' heads, represent a goddess, and, indeed, must represent one and the same goddess. . . . The important question now presents itself: What goddess is it who is here found so repeatedly, and is, moreover, the only one to be found upon the idols, drinking cups, and vases? The answer is: She must necessarily be *the tutelary goddess of Troy*, she must be *the Ilian Athena;* and this, indeed, perfectly agrees with the statement of Homer, who continually calls her θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη—"the goddess Athena with the owl's face." For the epithet γλαυκῶπις has been wrongly translated by the scholars of all ages, because they could not imagine that Athena should have been represented with an owl's face. The epithet, however, consists of the two words γλαῦξ and ὠπή, [rather ὤψ,] and, as I can show by an immense number of proofs, the only possible literal translation is "with an owl's face;" and the usual translation, "with blue, fiery or sparkling eyes," is utterly wrong. The natural conclusion is that, owing to progressive civilization, Athena received a human face, and her former owl's head was transformed into her favorite bird, the owl, which, as such, is unknown to Homer. The next conclusion is that the worship of Athena as the tutelary goddess of Troy was well known to Homer; hence, that a Troy existed, and that it was situated on the sacred spot the depths of which I am investigating.

In like manner, when excavations shall be made in the Heræum between Argos and Mycenæ, and on the site of the very ancient temple of Hera on the island of Samos, the image of this goddess with a cow's head will, doubtless, be found upon idols, cups, and vases; βοῶπις, the usual epithet of Hera in Homer, can originally have signified nothing else than "with the face of an ox." But as Homer also sometimes applies the epithet βοῶπις to mortal women, it is probable that even at his time it was considered to be bad taste to represent Hera, the wife of the mightiest of all the gods, with the face of an ox, and that, therefore, men even at that time began to represent her with a woman's face, but with the eyes of

an ox, that is, with very large eyes; consequently the common epithet of *βοῶπις*, which had formerly been only applied to Hera with the meaning of "with the face of an ox," now merely signified with large eyes.*

To this exposition of Dr. Schliemann's views, we may with propriety, before leaving the topic, add a few sentences from the observations of his editor, the learned Philip Smith, whose high reputation for accurate scholarship entitles his words to more than ordinary weight. He says:—

The symbolism which embodied divine attributes in animal forms belonged unquestionably to an early form of the Greek religion, as well as to the Egyptian and Assyrian. The ram-headed Ammon, the hawk-headed Ra, the eagle-headed Nisroch, form exact precedents for an owl-headed Athena, a personation which may very well have passed into the slighter forms of owl-faced, owl-eyed, bright-eyed. Indeed, we see no other explanation of the constant connection of the owl with the goddess, which survived to the most perfect age of Greek sculpture. The question is not to be decided by an etymological analysis of the sense of *γλαυκῶπις* in the Greek authors, long after the old symbolism had been forgotten, nor even the sense which Homer may have attached to the word in his own mind. One of the most striking characters of his language is the use of *fixed epithets*, and he might very well have inherited the title of the tutelar goddess of the Ionian race with the rest of his stock of traditions. . . . We are expressing no opinion upon the accuracy of Schliemann's identification in every case; but the *rudeness* of many of his "owl-faced idols" is no stumbling-block, for the oldest and rudest sacred images were held in lasting and peculiar reverence. The Ephesian image of Artemis "which fell down from Jove" is a case parallel to what the "Palladium" of Ilium may have been.†

Schliemann's volume suggests many other topics of interest, which, were there space, we should be glad to discuss. In some cases we do not agree with the author in his deductions, in others we cannot divest ourselves of the impression that he has given undue weight to matters of doubtful value. Much of the space allotted to a very repetitious discussion, coming up again and again throughout the volume, upon the so-called *whorls*, might just as well, or better, have been devoted to some more instructive subject. A far smaller number than thirty-two plates, containing nearly two hundred distinct illustrations of this class of objects would have sufficed. The appearance upon so many of the whorls of figures bearing an indubitable

* "Troy and its Remains," p. 112, etc. † Introduction, p. xix.

resemblance to the "*Suastika*," said to be a religious symbol of the Aryan race, is certainly a curious phenomenon. Most of Schliemann's explanations of other marks found associated with the "Suastika," however, are fanciful to the last degree. We are much mistaken if what he styles "rising suns," etc., are not mere lines for decoration. As to the whorls themselves, it is certainly strange that they should be found in such great numbers, and at different depths, varying, according to figures upon the plates, from three to twelve meters, (ten to forty feet.) Their use, too, is an unsolved riddle. Schliemann repudiates the suggestion as untenable, that they served as weights to hold down the web in weaving, or as "sinkers" to the fishermen's nets. They could scarcely have been used for a primitive currency, as they are too little worn; nor as amulets, because of their inconvenient size and weight. He leans, therefore, to the conclusion that they were *ex votos*, or religious votive offerings; hence the emblem before referred to. Without pretending to pass definite judgment upon this opinion, we must say that it appears much more likely that they were intended for domestic use, and that their shape strongly suggests that they constituted part of the spindle. This well known implement as now made in the East is furnished with a disk of metal, the chief object of which is to keep up the motion imparted by twirling the spindle between the hands, or by rubbing it against the knee. The wooden stem, passing through the hole with which the whorls proper are all provided, has, of course, disappeared in the lapse of thousands of years. As every household was furnished with many specimens of an article of such absolute necessity, there is no difficulty in accounting for the great numbers of whorls found.

Dismissing, however, all subordinate questions raised by Schliemann's Troy, we must express ourselves well satisfied with the general results his discoveries point to. He has made out a good case in favor of Hissarlik's claim to be the site of the city which Homer intended by the term *Ilium*. He has proved that no other site has been adduced which shows any signs of having at any period contained a large city. On the other hand, Hissarlik *was* inhabited, and that for a period long enough to allow an enormous deposit of forty feet to accumulate. A layer of metallic *scoriæ*, throughout the hill, and

every-where traces of wood-work charred by fire, show that at least one of the four successive cities was destroyed in the way that Homer's Troy was sung by the poet to have been ruined. The city is, indeed, smaller than the poet's language might lead a reader to suppose; but that it was rich, and consequently able to secure a great number of auxiliaries, may fairly be inferred from the richness of the single collection of precious utensils, in gold, silver, electrum, and copper, which owes its preservation until our times to the apparently unpropitious circumstance of the conflagration causing its abandonment by its fugitive owner or plunderer.

Any attempt, however, to identify with close precision the localities referred to by Homer must, we fear, lead to disappointment. Schliemann does, indeed, believe that he has found the Scæan Gates in the double gate, the only entrance he has brought to light, and the Great Tower of Troy in the large defensive work, in immediate proximity to the gate, toward the east. He also designates the probable sites of the Temples of Minerva and Apollo, the latter identified by means of remains of a latter age. But, in the absence of all inscriptions belonging to the period of the Homeric Troy, we seem to lack convincing proof. Schliemann himself admits his belief that the poet was neither a native of this part of Asia, nor a contemporary of the events which he describes from mere tradition. In fact, conceding more than Mr. Gladstone, he supposes centuries to have intervened between the fall of the city and Homer—centuries during which the tragic fate of Troy had been in the mouth of all minstrels.* Add to this the certainty that the poet uses the customary liberty of all writers of epics, and embellishes his narrative when necessary to enhance the interest, and the difficulties in the way of establishing a minute correspondence between the statements of the Iliad and the discoveries will appear well nigh insurmountable.

We shall only repeat our conviction that Schliemann has rendered a great service to the cause of history and letters by the excavations, which are, upon the whole, well described, although with some repetitions and occasional obscurity, in the handsome volume before us.

* "Troy and its Remains," pp. 18, 20, 305.

## Art. IV.—CASE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

*Case and his Contemporaries;* Being a Biographical History of Methodism in Canada, from its Introduction till the Death of the Rev. William Case. Five volumes, 12mo. By Rev. John Carroll, D.D. Toronto: Methodist Book Room, Rev. Samuel Rose.

"Elder" Case, as the principal person in these volumes was frequently designated, died in 1855. He had been identified with Methodism in Canada from an early date, having spent more than half a century in its ministry. As his friends did not publish any biography respecting him, Dr. Carroll conceived the idea of preparing a work in which Case should be the central figure, and all his contemporaries who had been in the ranks should be briefly sketched, making a kind of itinerants' memorial, comprising all the events of Methodism in Canada during the first half century of its existence.

The amount of labor which the author has performed is prodigious, and we should think that but few could undergo the sacrifices which he has endured to make the work complete. Like many who have labored in the fields of literature, Dr. Carroll must regard his work as a labor of love, for he will never receive such remuneration as will be a compensation for his toil. Works of this kind are not sufficiently appreciated. Posterity will understand their worth better than the present generation.

The history of Methodism in Canada* possesses many features of thrilling interest. Its beginning was small, but its progress has been marvelous, while its present position may well excite gratitude. "The Lord hath done great things for us whereof we are glad." Three local preachers, two of whom belonged to the British Army, unknown to each other, were the first to raise the banner of Methodism on Canadian ground. In 1790 William Losee began his labors in what was known as the Bay Quinte Country. Many of the settlers were United Empire Loyalists, who had left the United States at the close of the Revolutionary War, and endured indescribable hardships in making themselves homes in the wilderness, where they were like sheep having no shepherd. The names of

* We use the word in its old acceptation, comprising the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

those pioneers deserve honorable mention, though none were more worthy than the Detlors, the Lawrences, the Emburys, and the Hecks, some of whom had the honor of laying the foundations of Methodism both in the United States and Canada.

Losee was a man of dauntless courage, indomitable perseverance, and great power in prayer. When any of "the sons of Belial" did not act with proper decorum, he would suddenly stop and exclaim, "My God, smite them!" and in several instances the offenders were smitten to the ground, and cried for mercy. During the first year he organized five classes, one of which was in Adolphustown, and was formed on the very day that the founder of Methodism died. True, Losee was only a preacher on trial in connection with the New York Conference, still his labors were greatly blessed. He was a faithful man, though some of his reproofs would hardly be tolerated at the present day. In one of his sermons he referred to the foolish practice of following the fashions in respect to dress, and said that he "verily believed that if it were fashionable to wear a half bushel on the head some Methodists would adopt it." For four years Mr. Losee labored in season and out of season, and then returned to the United States, where he died in the triumph of faith.

Darius Dunham was the first regular minister who came to Canada. He was well qualified for the work assigned him, as he was not only a good preacher, but understood well how to organize societies. His faithfulness occasionally brought him into trouble with delinquents, who styled him "scolding Dunham." He traveled only ten years, and was the first presiding elder. His name, and that of Joseph Jewell, who succeeded him, are still gratefully remembered. Calvin Wooster was among the early preachers who came to Canada, and though in seven years he became incapacitated for the labors of the itinerancy, his name will never be forgotten. When worn down with consumption, so that he could not speak aloud, his "whispering sermons" converted some who were privileged to hear him. His death was most glorious; one of his last sayings was, that "the nearer he drew to eternity, the brighter heaven shone upon him."

William Case, of whom our author desires particularly to

write, was born in Massachusetts, August, 1780. The famous "Old Bay State" has long been renowned for its excellent educational system; but at that date there were few schools or seats of learning. Case, however, enjoyed their advantages, and became a good penman, so that he was well qualified for the office of Conference Secretary, a position which he held for several years, when only few of his brethren could fill that position. His family removed to New York State, where he was converted when he was twenty-three years of age, and in two years afterwards he was exhorter and local preacher, and was recommended to the New York Conference as a suitable candidate for the itinerant work. The Conference was then very large, as it comprised all the "Empire State," some portions of New England, and the Canadas. Mr. Case states in his Jubilee Sermon that he only had two sermons when he entered the ministry. He felt very timid, and was the subject of peculiar emotions as he journeyed to Canada. Once he dismounted from his horse, and wept and prayed. These words were impressed upon his mind, "I will go before thee, and will prepare the hearts of the people to receive thee; and thou shalt have fathers and mothers and children in that land."

There were at that time only few preachers in Canada. Some of them became men of eminence, and are worthy of honorable mention. Henry Ryan was then a young man of great zeal, and for many years performed noble work among the Canadians. Bishop Hedding, with whom he traveled a circuit in Vermont, esteemed him very highly, and often spoke of him as "the brave Irishman." They could only meet occasionally, and when he did Ryan would generally salute his colleague thus: "Drive on, brother; drive the devil out of the country; drive him into the lake and drown him." Ryan became presiding elder; some regarded him as ambitious to rule in the Church, and he was so impetuous that he could not bear the least opposition. For years he desired to have a Conference formed in Canada, and then sought to have an entire separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and because this could not be immediately granted he agitated the societies and made divisions, and finally became the head of a separate body, long known as the Ryanites. All

must regret that one whose labors had been so abundant, and who had done so much good, should pursue a course which was attended with so much disaster, and which must have been the cause of bitter grief to Ryan himself. Had he been less precipitate he might have been honored to his dying day as one of the most illustrious men ever connected with the Methodist Church in Canada.

Nathan, afterward Dr., Bangs, was one of Case's contemporaries. He also was indebted to New England common schools for his education, and came to Canada to follow the profession of land surveyor. He, however, was converted under the labors of James Coleman, and became so renowned that he filled every office in the Church except that of Bishop, and died full of years and honors. His labors as a missionary were attended with many hardships, and even when stationed in what is now known as the city of Quebec he had such privations to endure as would astonish persons at the present day. Though after a few years he returned to the United States, he never ceased to take deep interest in all the affairs of Canadian Methodism.

We may mention a few instances of the hardships of those early pioneers. James Coleman, when traveling up the Mohawk River, slept fifteen nights in the woods, and built fires to keep off the beasts that roamed in the locality. Seth Crowell slept in the woods near where Brighton now stands, and set up a stone, and inscribed upon it with his knife, "Holiness to the Lord." Thomas Whitehead and family came to Niagara from Albany in an open boat, and were six weeks on the journey, and during all this time they subsisted on *boiled wheat*. Robert Hibbard was drowned in the Richelieu River while crossing a ferry, and his body was not found until several weeks had elapsed. J. G. Peal, having to cross Hay Bay in order to reach his evening appointment, found that the ice was too weak to bear his horse. He therefore put the animal in care of a friend, and walked across the bay without his boots, as in no other way could he tread the slippery pavement. He went to his lodgings after service, but he had taken such a cold that an alarming illness seized him, and in a few days he died. His remains are interred near Odessa, in passing which the writer has often raised his hat in honor of the illustrious

dead. John Dempster, afterward Dr. Dempster,* the famous missionary to Buenos Ayres, South America, and the founder of biblical schools, commonly called theological colleges, commenced his labors on the St. Lawrence Circuit, which was "a vast field, and most of it a wilderness. During the cold season his horse broke down, and he went to his appointments on foot. His boots gave out, but he went on still, his feet constantly wet with snow-water, nothing daunted, to fill his appointments. His soul blazed, while his poor body shivered and withered under hardships too terrible for humanity to endure. The next Conference found him in a broken-down condition."

Mr. Case endured a good share of the hardships and inconveniences connected with the pioneer work of Methodism in Canada. At an early period he was made presiding elder, and at one time his district comprised the greater part of the country now known as the London Conference. There were no railways and but few steamboats, even in summer. All his journeys were performed on horseback, and, as he did not enter the state of matrimony until he was nearly fifty years of age, he had no certain dwelling-place. He was beloved by the people, and was always a welcome guest wherever he might choose to take up his abode. Still, it is astonishing how he could keep up an extensive correspondence, act as a kind of general superintendent, and provide means for carrying on the work of God in the country with such accommodations as he possessed. For many years there was no Missionary Society and no Book Room. The Book Agents at New York intrusted him with books for the missionaries and others, and looked to him for returns, so that his duties were exceedingly multifarious, and were often a source of much perplexity.

One of his associates† in the old Genesee Conference thus wrote respecting him:—

> Scarce any other member in old Genesee was more widely known or more generally beloved. Though in the pulpit he was by no means remarkable, his executive talent was of a high order, and he knew how to plan as well as how to execute. As presiding elder he was among the very best. His wakeful eye swept a broad field, and he always knew how to select the more salient points. The mission was projected and the circuit formed at just the right

* "Methodist Quarterly Review," 1864, p. 361.

† George Peck, D.D., "Methodist Quarterly Review," 1860, p. 599.

time and place. If a church was to be erected, he was the right man to consult. He took his pocket rule with him into the pulpit, and often at the close of a service would measure heights and distances in and about it, so as to be prepared to give advice elsewhere. Nothing that concerned either the temporal or spiritual good of the Church within his appropriate field escaped his observation. Practical wisdom was his distinguishing characteristic. His zeal to do good knew no bounds. Sacrifice, and trial, and suffering, so far from being appalling, were his supreme delight. He counted not his life dear, if he might but extend the triumphs of Immanuel's reign.

Dr. Carroll says:—

Our subject had a well-cultivated mind, and was really an accomplished Christian gentleman. A more agreeable companion is, indeed, seldom found. He mingled cheerfulness with gravity, and the playfulness of the child with the wisdom of the sage. With a sanctified heart, a polished intellect, a fine person, and a musical voice, he was fit to mingle in any society. Such a man could not fail to have warmly attached friends, and no man certainly ever better deserved to have them.

Though Case held a ready pen, he did not write largely. His migratory habits would not admit of it. Till the last few years of his life, when his labors were comparatively local, he was almost continually on the move. Emphatically may it be said of him—more so, perhaps, than of most other itinerants—"he had no certain dwelling-place." Still he wrote frequently for our Church periodicals, and will be found by the future historian to have contributed much that cannot fail to be of permanent value to coming generations.

In 1824 a Conference was formed in Canada, which was permitted by the General Conference of 1828 to become independent. The episcopal form of government was retained, but the persons nominated for Bishop declined to act; therefore Mr. Case was really Bishop *pro tem.* He served in that capacity for four years, and was an able executive officer. His mild manner, his extensive knowledge of Methodist usage, and his general urbanity, were of great service to him.

The Wesleyans in England had for some years sustained a mission in Canada, but in 1820, by a mutual agreement, Upper Canada was left in charge of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Lower Canada was wholly given to the Wesleyan missionaries. For a time this arrangement answered well, but emigrants from England were constantly settling in Upper Canada, and by their repeated solicitations English missionaries were again sent to the country. As a matter of course, un-

seemly strife followed, but in 1832 the Canada Conference united with the English Conference on such a plan as was deemed equitable and honorable to all parties, so that a career of prosperity was anticipated. But alas! the changes made, particularly in relation to withholding ordination from local preachers, was the cause of many years' strife. A few of this class of persons and a superannuated minister met together about a year after the union, and formed themselves into a Conference, and claimed to be the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada. Litigation respecting Church property followed, but in no instance did the dissentients gain a single case.

The union with the English Conference was, unhappily, broken off in 1840, but in 1847 it was renewed, and continued until 1874, when the parent Conference agreed to dissolve the connection, and the present Methodist Church of Canada was formed, embracing the Wesleyan Conferences of Canada and Eastern British America, and the Conference of the late Methodist New Connection.

Elder Case, though an American by birth, was a true lover of English Methodism, and during the years of separation he remained with the few who preferred the connection with the English Conference. His course in thus acting was inexplicable to many; but, though there was occasional bitterness between some who had been allied to each other, none could charge him with acting otherwise than as the Christian gentleman.

Mr. Case will always be best known as the father of Indian missions. For many years he, like others, sighed over the degradation of the native tribes, and many a time did he pray for an open door among those poor aborigines. In 1823 Peter Jones, of blessed memory, was converted at a camp-meeting held at Ancaster. He was a half Indian, and when made a new creature Mr. Case exclaimed, "Bless God, the door is now open to the Indian tribes!" This was a true prophecy, for now began a most glorious work among the native population. Peter Jones became known every-where, and, in company with Mr. Case, he visited many places in the United States for the purpose of raising means to carry on the work of God among this people. Some of the chiefs became the subjects of saving grace; among others who became prominent among their brethren may be mentioned Thomas Davis, Peter Jacobs, John

Sunday, William Herkimer, Abraham Sickles, Allan Salt, Henry Stienhaur, and others. Schools were established, and translations of the Scriptures in due time were made, toward which noble work the Bible Society rendered much valuable aid. Mr. Case was ably assisted in this important work by Messrs. E. Ryerson, J. Evans, J. Stinson, T. Hurlburt, and others; but for many years the labor chiefly devolved upon him. His correspondence, some of which we have read, reveals the deep anxiety which he felt for the poor Indians, and how his whole soul was absorbed concerning their welfare. During one of his visits to the United States he was in company with Bishop George, who called upon him to pray, and Mr. Case could not pray about any thing else than the work of God among the Indians. In speaking of the circumstance some time afterward, the Bishop said it seemed as though Elder Case forgot all about white people, and prayed as though the Indians were the only people possessed of souls.

The work among the Indians excited great interest both in England and America. The visits of Peter Jones, Peter Jacobs and John Sunday to the father-land awakened a deep sympathy for their mission. The writer, then a boy, remembers how the largest places of worship were crowded to their utmost capacity, while all classes of the community, from royalty downward, were greatly interested. Mr. Case was now full of gladness, and when the missions were established in Hudson's Bay Territory he rejoiced with exceeding joy, because increasing efforts were thus put forth on behalf of the Indian tribes.

The poor Indians revered him as a father. His patience with their slow progress and his gentleness endeared him to all the tribes. His manner was captivating, and at the same time instructive, though he knew how to give a gentle reproof. With a view to instruct them in the ordinary affairs of life he used to hold an "inquiry meeting," at which he encouraged them to ask questions concerning any point on which he had discoursed. On one occasion Job was the subject. His case greatly interested the natives, who seemed to regard his vast possessions of sheep, camels, oxen, and asses, as really fabulous. When their curiosity was fully aroused, the teacher said, "Suppose Job should pay you a visit, and walk around among you,

and look at the way you farm, and look at your cows, and oxen, and pigs, what do you think he would say?" "Don't know. What you think he say?" "Well, I think he would shake his head, and say, 'This catching *musk-rat* is a small business!'" The reproof was felt, though none were offended; but it became a proverb among them—"catching musk-rat is a small business."

From 1828 to 1855 Elder Case might be said to be almost wholly devoted to the mission among the Indians. For fourteen years he was principal of one of the Industrial Schools, and during the last three years of his life he was left at leisure to labor as he thought proper. "At least fourteen bands of wandering pagans were converted." The work was often very discouraging, by reason of close proximity to the whites, whose conduct was the cause of much injury to the poor natives of the forest. Had they been colonized on the north shore of Lake Superior, as was recommended by Lord Elgin and others, and could they have been kept wholly distinct and separate from the whites, there is no doubt that now they would have presented a much better appearance than they do. The white man's vices have been their ruin; yet hundreds became the recipients of saving grace and died triumphing in Jesus. Many of them will be Mr. Case's crown of rejoicing in heaven.

The various events at which we have thus briefly glanced are detailed at great length by our author, but space prevents our entering into more minute particulars. As Dr. Carroll was an actor in the scenes, and took deep interest in all the affairs of Methodism, his narratives may be depended upon. The third volume, which contains a condensed account of Methodism during the eventful years of 1824–1835, is a most valuable book of reference, and all who wish to become thoroughly acquainted with Methodism in Canada during those exciting years would do well to read this portion of our author's record, which is truly an embodiment of facts with which all interested in the subject would do well to make themselves familiar.

The Methodists in Canada have always been strong advocates for the unification of Methodism. The population of the country for many years was necessarily much scattered; consequently, the ordinances of religion could not be maintained but at a great outlay of men and means. Hence, when rival altars were

erected in close proximity to those already established, it could not but be the occasion of much grief to those who desired that there should be no schism in the body. The union with the British Conference, therefore, was hailed generally with delight, the advantages of which were soon seen, inasmuch as some able ministers were sent out, and a large amount of pecuniary assistance was rendered. The pulpit and administrative labors of Revs. R. Alder, D.D.; G. Marsden; W. M. Harvard, D.D.; J. Dixon, D.D.; J. Stinson, D.D.; M. Richey, D. D.; W. Lord; W. L. Thornton; E. Wood, D. D.; and W. Morley Punshon, LL.D., could not but prove highly acceptable, and tend to the establishment and extension of Methodism in the country. True, some of those ministers only remained a short time in Canada, but the remembrance of them is still fragrant. Dr. Stinson was abundant in labors as general superintendent and afterward president of Conference. Dr. Punshon gave a great impetus to all the affairs of the Church. Under his administration the endowment of Victoria College was inaugurated, the Metropolitan Church was built in Toronto, and the mission to Japan was commenced. Drs. Richey and Wood still, happily, linger among us, though the former has long been incapacitated for labor; but the latter is still vigorous, and has been permitted to see many great improvements in Methodism. He was president of Conference eight years, and has dedicated a greater number of churches than any other minister in Canada, and, though he is now in the fifty-first year of his ministry, he has always been connected with the mission work.

It must not, however, be supposed that the Methodists in Canada were so enamored with their British associations as to forget their former friends. Far from it. They feel that they can never repay their debt of obligation to the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States. The pioneer Bishop, Asbury, made a tour through a portion of the country just before the war of 1812, and was greatly pleased with his visit, and entertained great hopes of the future. Others of the Bishops, as George and Hedding, presided at Conferences held in Canada, and were always most cordially welcomed both by ministers and people. Bishop George once presided at a Conference held at Elizabethtown, when such an

outpouring of the Holy Spirit took place as had never been witnessed on any similar occasion. A great number of conversions took place, in consequence of which this memorable event was always spoken of as "the Revival Conference." From the time of the separation, in 1828, there has been the most cordial feeling between the two bodies, which have reciprocated several fraternal visits with each other.

Mr. Case, by reason of his extensive knowledge of the societies in Canada, became acquainted with many young men such as were likely to become useful in the Church, and soon brought them to his aid. In this way the three brothers, Revs. John, William, and Egerton, Ryerson, were called into the work. The first and last still remain in the Church militant, in which they have performed invaluable service. William has gone to his reward after serving his generation faithfully. Egerton has been the most versatile. His powerful pen has often been wielded on behalf of the Church of his youth; not a few of the privileges which it now enjoys are to be attributed to his polemical skill; while his labors in the State, as the organizer of our public school system, have been of such a character as to have stamped his impress largely upon the country. The Church honored him by making him president of the first General Conference, in 1874. Anson Green, D.D., who entered the ministry about the same time as his life-long friend, Dr. Ryerson, has been very conspicuous in the Church, having been president of Conference on two different occasions, and for many years Book Steward. The brothers Hurlburt, four of whom have been in the ministry, may also be mentioned here. Elder Case was much attached to all those honored brethren, besides numerous others whom he also induced to enter the active work. Considering the few educational advantages which the country afforded, it is marvelous that so many of the coadjutors of Mr. Case became such able ministers of the New Testament. They read well the standards of Methodist theology, and, by reason of almost constant preaching, they became clear expounders of the Scriptures. Among others may be mentioned F. Metcalf, A. Prindell, H. Wilkinson, G. Ferguson, W. Chamberlayne, T. Madden, R. Jones, J. Carroll, D.D., W. Jeffers, D.D., J. Richardson, D.D., afterwards bishop of the M. E. Church, Canada, and a host of others.

The tide of emigration brought some young men of promise to the shores of Canada, whom Elder Case was not slow to lay his hands upon and assure them that the Lord had need of them. Two brothers, Revs. J. and E. Evans, deserve honorable mention under this head. It is worthy of remark that they and the eloquent Cookman, who was lost in the unfortunate "President," when crossing the Atlantic, were local preachers together in England, and frequently met for mutual counsel, and afterward spent many years in preaching the Gospel in the western world. The Rev. J. Evans was the founder of missions in Hudson's Bay Territory, and invented the syllabic character, which has been of immense value to all who have since labored to propagate the Gospel among the natives of that land. The younger of the two, Ephraim, now Dr. Evans, became editor of the *Christian Guardian*, and had the honor of being the first missionary to British Columbia, where he labored for nine years as the pioneer in that country.

Mr. Case and his contemporaries felt the need of providing educational facilities for the youth of the country, including the rising ministry. At an early period they held many conversations upon the subject, and in correspondence with those who were connected with collegiate institutions he sought to elicit such information as would aid them in the enterprise. The institution now known as Victoria University was at first established as an academy, and then as a college, with university powers. Its value to Canada has never been duly appreciated. Many sacrifices have been endured by those connected with that seat of learning. Case and his associates often taxed their own limited allowances that they might keep the college afloat, and when Parliament granted Methodist ministers the privilege to solemnize matrimony, they generously contributed all the fees which they might thus receive to the funds of the college. The original cost was $30,000, a large sum for those days. Dr. Richey was the first principal, and Dr. Ryerson the first president.

In the same way they sought to establish a weekly journal, which has long been known as the *Christian Guardian*. One of Case's *protégés*, Rev. E. Ryerson, was the first editor, and in its columns he wrote those burning words which had so

much to do in molding the character of the country, and promoting the rights of all classes of the community. These self-sacrificing men were also among the first to advocate the cause of temperance. They exhorted their people to shun the intoxicating draught, and during all the years of the temperance campaign, Methodist ministers and their people have always been associated with those who maintained unceasing warfare against the evils of intemperance.

It was often asserted by Mr. Wesley, that whenever the subject of holiness or perfect love was extensively preached a revival was almost sure to follow. The truth of this saying has often been verified in the history of Methodism. Dr. Carroll has recorded several instances of this kind. The camp-meetings were seasons of great spiritual power, and gave an impetus to the work of God, particularly in new places. If sinners were not converted and believers sanctified, there were great searchings of heart, and many inquiries were made as to why such a strange occurrence should befall the Church. Revivals were frequent, not as the result of employing any special evangelist, —for such an agency was unknown in the early periods of Methodism—but as the result of the pious toils of the preachers in charge, who labored in the confident expectation of seeing sinners converted and the borders of Zion extended. The Conference of 1855 was the last which the venerable Case attended. According to previous arrangement, he then preached a jubilee sermon. He was seventy-five years of age, and was a fine specimen of the aged minister, but was still vigorous, and none supposed that it was the last time he would appear among his brethren. For more than an hour he gave them an account of the past, and as he detailed the straits and sufferings of many of the early settlers, and reviewed the labors of those who had ministered unto them in holy things, when roads were almost impassable, and churches of the humblest character hardly had an existence, many tears of joy were shed for the great things which God had done for his Church. A few months afterward this apostle to the Indians sustained an injury by a fall as he was mounting his horse, from which he never fully recovered. In the month of October, 1855, he passed away, and was laid in the burial ground at Alderville, amid the sobs and tears of many of his brethren and friends,

and numerous Indians, who wept at the decease of one to whom they were under such lasting obligations.

His name will never be forgotten. A marble tablet is erected to his memory in Bridge-street Church, Belleville, and a monument has been built at his grave by his brethren in the ministry.

How great the changes in Methodism during Mr. Case's career! When he came to Canada there were seven circuits, ten preachers, and sixteen hundred and forty-nine members in society, and seven churches, none of which were finished. At the time of his death there were two hundred and ten circuits and missions, three hundred and thirty itinerants, and thirty-eight thousand members; numerous costly churches, an extensive Book Room, a popular University, and a Missionary Society with an income of $38,000. He knew more than two hundred ministers who had been converted in Canada, some of whom were Indians.

We have read these interesting volumes on Case and his contemporaries with great pleasure. We are astonished at the author's industry in searching among old documents, performing toilsome journeys, and writing an almost incalculable number of letters, to ascertain particulars respecting some thirteen hundred contemporaries of the Rev. William Case. No name has been omitted, and, though it would be impossible but that mistakes must occur in such a work in which so many details are given, we think it will be found singularly free from inaccuracies. "Case and his Contemporaries" will be a valuable book of reference to all who wish to become acquainted with the men who have labored in the Methodist Church in Canada during the first half century of its existence. May the venerable author receive ample reward for his labor of love!

## ART. V.—EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY.

[SECOND PAPER.]

IV. *Probable Reconstruction.* — All the schemes for readjusting the Egyptian chronology may be reduced to essentially two. The earliest was that adopted by the Christian chronographers who have handed down Manetho's lists. They simply added together his numbers, with such modifications as they found necessary in order to accommodate their own systems. Substantially the same method has been pursued by modern German Egyptologists in general, but with the additional complication of the recently deciphered inscriptions.* The result of this process, which we may designate as the *continuous* plan, has been, in both cases, as we have seen, the production of different sets of chronologies, which agree in scarcely any thing except their enormous extravagance of length.† The

*The latest and most pretentious (yet, we are constrained to say, the most obviously preposterous and artificial) attempt in this direction is that made by Dr. H. Brugsch ("*Geschichte Aegyptens*"—Leipz., 1877, 8vo., pp. 818,) who, acting on the hint of Herodotus, (ii, 142,) to which, however, Brugsch does not refer, gravely *estimates* uniformly three reigns of equal length to every hundred years, and accordingly dates (without the least regard to the numbers either of Manetho or the monuments) all the reigns of the first twenty-one dynasties regularly in each century, after the following formula, (pp. 765–770:).

———————, .. B. C. 00
———————, .. " 66
———————, .. " 33
———————, .. " 00

He even pursues this arbitrary method with dynasties eighteen to twenty-four, respecting which we have many contemporaneous data positively proving its falsity. (He says "*geb.*," that is, *born*, but he evidently means *reigned.*)

This is a most *naïve* illustration of what Mr. Joseph Cook calls the method of "small philosophers," namely, "to guess at the half, and then multiply by two!" Brugsch literally *guesses at the third, and then multiplies by three.*

Dr. Brugsch frankly avows (p. 40) that "no mortal can at present resolve the difficulties arising from the fragmentary condition of the Turin Papyrus, so as to reconstruct the list of kings."

† Brugsch assigns the kingdom of Egypt an antiquity of B. C. 4,455 or 4,400, and some of his fellow-countrymen a still greater, (as Böck, B. C. 5,702; Unger, B.C. 5,613.) But these high figures are contradicted by a singular mathematical evidence of the comparatively recent formation of Egypt itself. That country has literally been created by the gradual deposition of the mud of the Nile, as Herodotus has remarked. (History, ii, 5.) Now, the annual inundation deposits this at a very uniform rate, which has been calculated, as the re-

# NASTIES.

N. B.—The numerals appended to the
se and those in the second column
fro

| B. C. about | Thinites. | Tanites. | Bubastites. | Related Hebrew Events. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9515 | | | | End of flood. |
| 2500 | | | | Misraim. |
| 9417 | I. Menes..... | | | |
| 2395 | ..... | | | |
| 2357 | ..... | | | |
| 2353 | Athothis..... | | | |
| 2338 | Cencheres.... | | | |
| 2321 | ..... | | | |
| 2304 | ..... | | | |
| 2297 | Ouanephres .. | | | |
| 2289 | ..... | | | |
| 2274 | Ousaphais .... | | | |
| 2259 | ..... | | | |
| 2254 | Miebidos..... | | | |
| 2250 | ..... | | | |
| 2244 | ..... | | | |
| 2237 | ..... | | | |
| 2228 | Semempses... | | | |
| 2218 | ..... | | | |
| 2210 | Bieneches.... | | | |
| 2186 | ..... | | | |
| 2184 | II. Boëthos..... | | | |
| 2166 | ..... | | | |
| 2168 | ..... | | | |
| 2159 | ..... | | | |
| 2147 | ..... | | | |
| 2146 | Calechos..... | | | |
| 2130 | ..... | | | |
| 2127 | ..... | | | |
| 2120 | ..... | | | |
| 2110 | ..... | | | |
| 2107 | Binothris..... | | | |
| 2105 | ..... | | | |
| 2099 | ..... | | | |
| 2091 | ..... | | | |
| 2087 | ..... | | | |
| 2083 | ..... | | | |
| 2081 | ..... | | | |
| 2080 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Abraham in Egypt. |
| 2070 | ..... | | | |
| 2062 | ..... | | | |
| 2060 | Tlas..... | | | |
| 2051 | ..... | | | |
| 2043 | Sethenes ..... | | | |
| 2033 | ..... | | | |
| 2031 | ..... | | | |
| 2017 | ..... | | | |
| 2004 | ..... | | | |
| 2003 | ..... | | | |
| 2002 | Chaires..... | | | |
| 1990 | ..... | | | |
| 1985 | Nephercheres. | | | |
| 1984 | ..... | | | |
| 1983 | ..... | | | |
| 1960 | Sesochris .... | | | |
| 1954 | ..... | | | |
| 1947 | ..... | | | |
| 1940 | ..... | | | |
| 1937 | ..... | | | |
| 1936 | ..... | | | |
| 1914 | ..... | | | |
| 1913 | Cheneres..... | | | |
| 1905 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Joseph sold. |
| 1896 | ..... | | | |
| 1886 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Joseph promoted. |
| 1883 | ..... | | | |
| 1882 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Removal to Egypt. |
| 1874 | ..... | | | |
| 1870 | ..... | | | |
| 1861 | ..... | | | |
| 1854 | ..... | | | |
| 1838 | ..... | | | |
| 1804 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Joseph died. |
| 1802 | ..... | | | |
| 1779 | ..... | | | |
| 1771 | ..... | | | |
| 1762 | ..... | | | |
| 1758 | ..... | | | |
| 1745 | ..... | | | |
| 1740 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Moses born. |
| 1738 | ..... | ..... | ..... | Exode. |
| 1648 | ..... | | | |
| 1488 | ..... | | | |
| 1470 | ..... | | | |
| 1457 | ..... | | | |
| 1444 | ..... | | | |
| 1442 | ..... | | | |
| 1395 | ..... | | | |
| 1393 | ..... | | | |
| 1275 | ..... | | | |
| 1269 | ..... | | | |
| 1262 | ..... | | | |
| 1200 | ..... | | | |
| 1249 | ..... | | | |
| 1188 | ..... | | | |
| 1176 | ..... | | | |
| 1155 | ..... | | | |
| 1154 | ..... | XI. Smendes..... 26 | | |
| 1095 | ..... | Psousennes I... 41 | | |
| 1073 | ..... | Nephelcheres... 4 | | |
| 1031 | ..... | Amenophthis... 9 | | |
| 1027 | ..... | Osorchon..... 6 | | |
| 1009 | ..... | Psinaches..... 9 | | |
| 1000 | ..... | Psousennes II.. 14 | | |
| 986 | ..... | | XXII. Shishak ... 21 | |

GENERAL LIBRARY University of MICHIGAN

other mode of treating these two classes of records, which, for convenience' sake, we may term the *parallelistic* one, employed by the English Egyptologists—being substantially that of Poole, as originally suggested by Lane—is a far more critical procedure. A careful analysis of the ancient documents and a laborious comparison of the monumental records reveal the fact that many of the reigns were CONTEMPORANEOUS with each other, not only with respect to individual princes, but whole dynasties.* This greatly reduces the aggregate length of the entire period, and enables us to bring it within the compass of authentic history.

We might have suspected this fact *a priori*, from the discrepancy often occurring between the totals given by Manetho as the duration of the several dynasties, and the actual footing up of the numbers. For example: we have seen in the first dynasty the caption assigns a length of 253 (variations, 258, 252, 226) years, while the actual aggregate is 263 (variations, 247, 230) years. So of other dynasties. In like manner Manetho sums up the several sections of his list differently from the amount of their respective aggregates; and his grand total is stated at 3,555 years, whereas the actual sum of all his reigns is 5,462. The only way to explain this so as to save his credit at all is to make not only individual reigns, but whole dynasties, more or less contemporary with each other.

sult of several careful and independent examinations, to be .4134 of a foot per century. Again, repeated excavations in various parts of Egypt show that this deposit is nowhere over 26¼ feet deep, *sea-sand* being invariably discovered underlying it. Therefore, Egypt, as a habitable land, is not older than B.C. 4,500, having been covered anterior to that date at furthest by the waters of the Mediterranean up to the first cataract. (De Lanoye's "Rameses the Great," pp. 30, 31.) Herodotus expressly states that in the time of Menes, the first king, it was a complete swamp below Thebes, (ii, 4.) That the above-mentioned stratum of sand was originally the head or shore of a *salt* sea is proved by the fact that wells sunk anywhere in the alluvial plain, even of Thebes, yield very brackish water only, (Klunzinger, Upper Egypt, p. 136,) while the Nile water is proverbially sweet. Herodotus long ago shrewdly observed that "the country above Memphis seems formerly to have been an arm of the sea," (ii, 10,) and he speaks of the saline acridity of the soil, (ii, 12.) The Delta, however, is not a marine formation. (Rawlinson, Herodotus, ii, 5, note.)

* One of the latest and most expert French Egyptologists, M. de Rougé, candidly admits that the earlier dynasties in the lists of Manetho merely represent sovereigns of a part of the country, contemporary with other Pharaohs. ("Recherches," p. 4; "Exposé," p. 17.)

This appears still more conclusively on a detailed examination.*

The following are the most important evidences of this coincidence in time among these regnal years. In the first dynasty Menes reigned, according to Africanus, 62 years, but according to Eusebius, only 30; his son, Athothis, 57, (Afric.,) or 27, (Euseb.,) and grandson, Cenchenes, 31, (Afric.,) or 39, (Euseb.) In the third dynasty the first king, Necherophes, (Euseb., Necherochis,) reigned (according to both authors) 28 years, and his son, Tosorthros, (Euseb., Sosorthros,) 29. Now, Athothis and Tosorthros, or Sosorthros, seem to be only orthographical variations of the same name, and if we suppose that after Menes had established his kingdom for thirty-two years at This he associated his son Athothis with him upon the throne for the remaining thirty years of his life, we have an explanation of the apparent discrepancy in the length of his reign. Again, Athothis surviving his father twenty-seven years, we have the discrepancy in his years also explained. Once more, if upon the association of Athothis with his father, Necherophes (perhaps another son or a grandson) was placed at the head of the newly formed province of Memphis, and ruled there for twenty-eight years, on his decease Athothis may naturally have united both crowns in himself for the remainder of his life, which would be the twenty-nine years required. The subjoined table will make this clear:—

| I. Thinites. | | III. Memphites. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Menes alone ..... | 32 | | |
| " jointly ..... | 30 | Necherophes ..... | 28 |
| | 62 | | |
| Athothis jointly ..... | 30 | Athothis viceroy ..... | 2 |
| " alone ..... | 27 | " alone ..... | 27 |
| | 57 | | 29 |

It thus appears that the first and the third dynasties were parallel in time, and intimately associated in rule; that, in fact, they were but co-ordinate branches of one government. The same is, doubtless, the case with the second and the fourth dynasties, so far as their respective duration admitted, for they

* Palmer ("Egyptian and Sacred Chronology Harmonized"—London: 1861, two vols., 8vo.) has elaborately compared the ancient chronographies, but his corrections and emendations of Manetho, although highly ingenious, are to an equal degree conjectural and problematical.

evidently followed immediately upon the others severally, being classified according to the two capitals already seen to be established. Nor are we left to mere probability, for the name of the fourth king of the second dynasty is actually found in connection with that of some of the earlier kings of the fourth dynasty. For a similar reason we might presume that the sixth, seventh, and eighth dynasties were consecutive (although Poole introduces an interval before the sixth) with the fourth, and there is confirmation of this view in the coincidences which will presently be adduced.

That the former part, at least, of the fifth dynasty was contemporaneous with the fourth is proved by the fact that the names of the first four kings occur in inscriptions along with those of the fourth dynasty. We might, as above, have presumed such a parallelism from the difference in the capital after which this dynasty is named. Poole supposes that this (fifth) dynasty contained many more names than Manetho's list gives, but this is immaterial for our present purpose.

The ninth dynasty (with its sequent, the tenth) establishes several important coincidences, its kings being found in juxtaposition with those of the sixth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fifteenth dynasties. Thus the tablet in the "Hall of Ancestors" at Karnak has, if Poole has rightly arranged it, the following associations:—

| No. in Tablet. | Manetho. Dyn. | No. | No. in Tablet. | Manetho. Dyn. | No. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | XI. | .. | 17 | IX. | .. |
| 2 | " | .. | 18 | " | .. |
| 3 | " | .. | 19 | " | .. |
| 4 | " | .. | 20 | " | .. |
| 5 | " | .. | 21 | VI. | 1 |
| 6 | " | .. | 22 | " | 4 |
| 7 | " | .. | 23 | " | 5 |
| 8 | XII. | 1 | .. | " | 6 |
| 9 | XI. | 17 | 24 | XV. | 1 |
| 10 | XII. | 2 | 25 | " | 2 |
| 11 | " | 3 | 26 | " | 3 |
| 12 | " | 4 | 27 | " | 4 |
| .. | " | 5 | 28 | " | 5 |
| 13 | " | 6 | 29 | " | ? 6 |
| 14 | " | 7 | 30 | (?) XIII. | ? 1 |
| 15 | IX. | 1 | 31 | " | ? 2 |
| 16 | " | .. | | | |

There are, also, the following definite synchronisms between different dynasties occurring on various inscriptions: Souphis I. (of dynasty four) with Ousercheres, (of dynasty five;) Pepi, (of

dynasty six,) contemporary with Ra-skenen, (of dynasty eleven;) Mentoph II., (middle of dynasty nine,) with Amunemhet I., (first of dynasty twelve.) Poole thinks he has also positive evidence of the synchronism of Oanos, of dynasty five, with Assa, (Staan,) of dynasty fifteen; and he has, therefore, supposed many unnamed kings to belong to the middle of the latter dynasty. Other coincidences of a like kind occur, but have been attributed to alterations by later hands.*

We have had reason above to suspect that kings of the same dynasty sometimes ruled contemporaneously. This is positively proved in several late instances by their names being placed together on the monuments. For example, the two Sufis of the fourth dynasty reigned together; Enteph I. or II. (of dynasty nine) is associated with Mentoph I., (of the same dynasty;) the forty-fourth year of Osirtesen I. (dynasty twelve) was coincident with the second of Amunemhet II., (dynasty twelve;) and the thirty-fifth of Amunemhet II. with the third of Osirtesen II. All these joint rulerships serve to abbreviate the chronology, as is seen by comparing Manetho's numbers

* The Sallier papyrus in the British Museum (translated in Bagster's "Records of the Past," vol. vii, p. 314) states that Raskenen, apparently Sesonchosis, the second prince of the twelfth [Theban] dynasty, was king of Upper Egypt during the rule of Rapepi, one of the Shepherd kings at Avaris, (evidently Aphobis, the third prince of the fifteenth [Hycsos] dynasty.) In our adjustment their reigns synchronize for nine years, (B. C. 1914–05.)

A tablet found at Tanis states that a period of 400 years elapsed between the reign of Sete, one of the Shepherd kings, and that of Rameses II., of the nineteenth dynasty. But the value of this chronological indication is neutralized by the evidently round number (four centuries) employed, and the uncertainty who is meant by the Seto referred to. Birch thinks it was Saites, the first of the fifteenth dynasty, ("Egypt from the Monuments," p. 132, Am. ed.) But this is impossible; for, as the Shepherds were expelled by the eighteenth dynasty, we would certainly have an interval of more than seven centuries. A translation of the inscription is given in "Records of the Past," vol. iv, p. 36; but it does not justify Birch's interpretation, the name of the Shepherd king in question being there read *Sutaapehpeh*.

Canon Cook (in "The Speaker's Commentary," vol. i, p. 448, Am. ed.) will have it that this Raskenen was the immediate predecessor of Amosis I., (of the eighteenth dynasty,) who expelled the Hycsos; and that the prince with whom he was contemporary was the Apophis of the Shepherd rule. Consequently, he insists that this Apophis was the *last* of the Hycsos, and not the fourth of the fifteenth dynasty, as Josephus expressly asserts. This is the key to his whole reconstruction of Egyptian chronology in its relation to biblical. But his scheme, while affording many striking coincidences, makes too many violent disruptions of all the documentary authorities to entitle it to acceptance.

with those of the monuments; but to what extent they may have prevailed is somewhat uncertain.

That the three dynasties of Hycsos, or Shepherd-kings, (dynasties fifteen to seventeen,) were contemporary with at least the Theban or Diospolite dynasties, (eleven to thirteen,) is not only shown by the above coincidences, but is confirmed by the direct statement of Manetho, that they were expelled by the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, (of the Theban line.) Whether any of the other dynasties continued so late as the time of this expulsion is uncertain. The unimportant fourteenth dynasty, being of a different designation, (Xoite,) is thought to have been parallel with the twelfth. Poole, followed by Wilkinson, holds that dynasties fifteen and sixteen of the Shepherds were contemporaneous with each other; but this arrangement, although convenient as shortening the period, seems to us not only improbable in itself, but also in conflict with the account in Manetho, as reported by Josephus, who sets down their total occupancy as lasting 511 years. This number, corrupted to 518, Africanus attributes to the fifteenth dynasty alone, (Euseb., 190.) According to the above synchronisms, we are only concerned to make the Shepherd sway continuous with the latter part of the twelfth and the whole of the thirteenth dynasties.

The nineteenth and twentieth dynasties, as being Diospolite, may be presumed to have been continuous with the eighteenth. But as the twenty-first was Tanitic, and in part at least a priestly usurpation, it may not only have been contemporary with the latter part of the twentieth, which betrays great weakness on the monuments, but occasionally with the neighboring twenty-second, (Bubastite,) which seems to have subdued the entire country.* Those who, like Poole, adopt the longer chronology of the Septuagint, do not feel the necessity of these last parallelisms, and those who adhere to "Usher's Chronology" will be obliged to introduce still further abbreviations at some point in the list. If, however, with many of the most recent authorities on biblical chronology, we reject the date (480th year) in 1 Kings vi, 1, and thus allow the history in the Book of Judges to be continuous, (as Paul evidently did, in Acts xiii, 20,) instead of making

* Birch admits the contemporaneousness of these dynasties, ("Egypt from the Monuments," p. 162, Am. ed.)

it parallel with itself, we shall have sufficient space for the time of the Egyptian kings, as above condensed. We may add that Poole's date for the beginning of the reign of Menes, B. C. 2717, (in which, however, he is not followed by Wilkinson,) is the result, indirectly, of his theory of the so-called Sothic and other cycles. The uncertainty of all such astronomical calculations we have pointed out under the article on Manetho, in our "Cyclopædia," to which, as well as to the article on Egypt, we refer our readers for details and literature on this subject. We here confine our attention to such works, whether recent or early, as directly deal with chronology. It will be seen that they do not essentially relieve the problem as found in the ancient authorities.

It remains for us to tabulate, by way of test and for convenience of reference, the results of the foregoing discussion, setting down the dynasties as above arranged, and their length according to the years when given on the monuments, or, when these fail, adopting those of Manetho as reported with the greatest probability. It is scarcely needful to remind the reader, once more, that in the frame-work of the fossil past thus reconstructed, of necessity not only are the articulations largely conjectural, but many of the component members themselves are little more than restored by estimate. We, therefore, reserve the privilege of amendment hereafter, if evidence shall seem to call for it.

We will let the reader into the secret of the structure of the accompanying complicated table. With the exceptions noted above, it is substantially the same as that which has been adopted by Wilkinson from Poole, and by the latter credited to Lane. The principal difference between our scheme and Poole's is in the neglecting of the Sothic dates, to which he arbitrarily adapts his whole chronology. These dates are the occurrence of the "heliacal rising" of Sothis, or the star Sirius, which he calculates to have taken place in B. C. 1322 and A. D. 139. The first of these alone is important. It is recorded in the fragments of Theon of Alexandria of the fourth century, as having taken place in the reign of Menophres, and is thought by Poole to be indicated in the zodiac on the ceiling of the Rameseum at Kurneh. But the name Menophres is found neither in Manetho nor on the monuments, and it can only be

conjectured that some prince by the name of Amenoph, or Menephtah, is meant. Two of the former occur in the eighteenth dynasty, and two of the latter in the nineteenth; and about the same period we have several princes by the name of Rameses, the second of whom (B. C. 1249–1183 in our dates) finished the building in which the above-mentioned zodiac is found. Another cycle, which Poole relies upon as furnishing several absolute dates, is that of the so-called reappearance of the Phœnix, which he thinks is likewise indicated on the same zodiac, and which Tacitus states (Annals, vi, 28) transpired at an interval of 1,461 years in the reign of Sesostris, and again in that of Amasis, and a third time in that of the third Ptolemy. The third Ptolemy was Euergetes, who reigned B. C. 247–222. The first period of 1,461 years before this would bring us to B. C. 1708–1683, where we look in vain for any Egyptian king whose name resembles Amosis. Ahmes II. reigned B. C. 569–525, and Ahmes I. (Amosis) reigned (according to us) B. C. 1492–1470; (Poole, B. C. cir. 1525.) Another period of 1,461 years brings us to B. C. 3169–3144, long before the Flood! Manetho's Sesostris (of the twelfth dynasty) reigned (according to us) B. C. 1861–1823; (Poole, B. C. cir. 1986;) and the Sesostris of Herodotus (ii, 102–110) and of Diodorus Siculus (i, 53–59) was Rameses II., of the other ancient writers and of the monuments, who reigned (according to us) B. C. 1249–1183; (Poole, B. C. cir. 1322.) From all this nothing satisfactory results. The last Egyptian cycle needful to be noticed here is what Poole calls the "Grand Panegyrical Month," consisting, according to him, of 30 Julian years. Dates in this cycle are supposed to be found in various reigns on the monuments, and from these Poole derives corroborations of his chronology. But, as we have shown in the article Manetho, in our Cyclopædia, already referred to, both the readings and calculations based upon those are too discordant and uncertain to be relied upon.

In our own scheme the chronology mounts, according to a simple process, from the fixed date, B. C. 969, when Shishak's twenty-first year has been made to coincide with Rehoboam's fifth, by the following steps, which are all furnished by the preceding summary of the lengths of the several dynasties, as settled by the comparison of Manetho's numbers with those of

the monuments, and as linked by the notes of contemporaneousness discovered as above. Allowing 20 years for Shishak's previous reign, and 135 years for dynasty twenty, (including the 109 of dynasty twenty-one,) we are brought up to B. C. 1124; and thence ascending by 178 years for dynasty nineteen, and 190 for dynasty eighteen, we arrive at the simultaneous close of dynasties thirteen and seventeen, in B. C. 1492. Once more rising directly by 266 years for dynasty thirteen, and 205 for dynasty twelve, (including the last name of Manetho's eleventh,) we come to B. C. 1963 as the close of dynasty eleven. The last king of this latter dynasty (the first of our twelfth) was the Amenemes of Manetho, who gives his years as 16, which would, therefore, be B. C. 1963–47; and his predecessor seems to have been the Soiconnos of Eratosthenes, who (incorrectly, it would seem) assigns him a reign of 60 years (that is, B. C. 2023–1963.) This Amenemes was followed by Sesonchosis, whose years on the monuments are 42 (B. C. 1947–1905.) Now, either this predecessor or this successor is evidently the Raskenen mentioned on a papyrus (according to Brugsch) as a contemporary of Pepi of the sixth dynasty at Memphis. This last king is usually identified with the long-lived Phiops of Manetho, as being the best known; although there is another similar name—Phios, or Pepi I., the second king of the same dynasty, whose regnal years are given on the monuments as 20.* Supposing Pepi II. (Phiops) to be meant,

* Poole thinks these two Pepis identical, chiefly on the ground of the resemblance of the adjoining names in Manetho's list. The Turin papyrus, however, seems to give them both, and this is confirmed by other monumental evidence. Josephus appears to have reference to one of these in a passage which is in singular analogy, yet disagreement, with the contents of the above inscription, as read by Brugsch. The latter records a reproof administered by Raskenen to Pepi for having favored the Shepherd invaders. (So Wilkinson, in Rawlinson's "Herodotus," ii, 292.) Josephus says, that in the time of the second Shepherd invasion, "Amenophis, the king of Egypt, upon his being informed of their invasion, was in great confusion, on calling to mind what Amenophis the son of Papas had foretold him." (*c. Ap.* 26.) These two Amenophis, however, he states, (*ibid.*,) were not contemporaries. It ought to be stated here—as it is but another evidence of the precariousness of the whole system of Egyptian chronology, as well as that of the foregoing reconstruction—that this notice of the coincidence of the names Raskenen and Pepi looks remarkably like another version merely of the concurrence of the same names alluded to in a foot-note above, (p. 466.) In any case, however, the limits of variation in this synchronism are confined to a comparatively small compass by the other notes of contemporaneousness.

his reign (90 years) will readily fall so as to cover nearly the whole period of the three reigns of Amenemes and his predecessor and successor, that is, B. C. cir. 2017–1927. Phiops was preceded by Methousouphis, and he by Phios, whose regnal years on the monuments are respectively 14 and 20. The predecessor of the last was Othoes, who reigned, according to Manetho, 30 years, (that is, B. C. 2081–2051,) and was the first king of the sixth dynasty. Mounting thence by the fourth dynasty, (188 years,) and the third, (116 years,) we reach B. C. 2385 as the beginning of dynasty third; and, as we have before shown that this dynasty began on the association with Menes (dynasty first) of his own son, we have to ascend 32 years more to the beginning, that is, B. C. 2417. Of course, we are not to look at that early date for an extensive empire or a numerous population; the Mizraite kingdom, doubtless, began, like most others, with a petty leader and a handful of relatives, who had emigrated to that fertile valley, where they increased with a rapidity characteristic of the country in ancient times. Their settlement at first so far up the river as This (if, indeed, that city be at Abydos) may be explained, perhaps, by the comparative marshiness at first of Lower Egypt. Their roving disposition seems to be evinced by their colonizing Memphis in the next generation.

V. *The "Hycsos" and the Israelites.*—The relation of these two classes to each other and to the other Egyptians is so interesting, if not intimate, especially to the biblical student, that our treatment of the subject we have chosen would be incomplete without a brief consideration of this topic. The discussion of it began as early as the days of Josephus, who, in fact, gives us, in the controversial passages to which we first referred, nearly all the information we possess on the question. He professes to cite the exact words of Manetho, and says, in substance, ("*Contra Apionem*," i, 14, 15,) that the Hycsos (a name which he etymologically interprets as meaning "Shepherd-kings") were an ignoble people, who invaded Egypt from the East (evidently meaning that they were Arabs) during the reign of Timæus, (a king nowhere else mentioned,*) and event-

* Osburn, in his off-hand way, identifies him with Amenemes III., (of the 12th dynasty,) whose name he confusedly writes Amens, ("Mon. Hist.," ii, p. 13,) that is, Ameres. This would be (in our date) B. C. cir. 1954, in the early part of the fifteenth dynasty.

nally established one of themselves, named Salatis, king, at Memphis, who founded a city on the Bubastic arm of the Nile, called Avaris, as a barrier against the Assyrians; but that after a domination of 511 years these people were attacked by "the kings of Thebais and the other parts of Egypt," (language which proves the contemporaneousness of the Theban line, at least,) who, under a king named Alisphragmuthosis, subdued them, and that his son Thummosis finally drove them out of the country. The extract from Manetho further states that these refugees were the builders of Jerusalem, a statement with which Josephus joins issue, as identifying them with the Hebrews; but the language may, perhaps, be referred to the Canaanites who fortified Jebus in the interval between the exodus and the time of David. Josephus then proceeds to recount the kings of Egypt after the expulsion of the Hycsos, beginning with Tethmosis; and the list is evidently that of Manetho's eighteenth dynasty, beginning with Amosis. In the other passage (*ibid.*, 26) Josephus cites a story from Manetho to the effect that the Jewish lawgiver, Moses, was the same as a priest, Osarsiph of Heliopolis, whom a degraded leprous caste of the Egyptians made their ruler in an insurrection, and invited the escaped Shepherds back to Egypt, where they ravaged the country and committed all sorts of atrocities. The Egyptian king under whom this revolt occurred is given as Amenophis, the father of Sethos-Ramses, and the son of Rhampses; names which clearly point to Menephtah I., of the nineteenth dynasty. The narrative goes on to state, however, that as soon as Amenophis, who at the time of the outbreak was absent in Ethiopia, returned with his army, he totally defeated and expelled the rebels. This account, of course, Josephus violently controverts; but there is no occasion to doubt its accuracy, except as to the evidently malicious and arbitrary identification of these leprous insurrectionists with the Hebrews. The most casual reader cannot fail, as Josephus intimates, to note the contradiction in Manetho, if he meant to make out an identity of the Jews with both the Hycsos and the rebels, since the Shepherds had been totally expelled long before the date of the lepers, and the Hebrews had but one exodus. In connection with these excerpts from Manetho, Josephus cites passages from Chæremon and others, bearing upon the

same subject, but they contain nothing of importance to our purpose. We are not concerned here to refute, whether indignantly or coolly, either part of this migration as a garbled account of the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt; our only object is to ascertain, if possible, its chronological position with reference to the exodus. We know of no positive method for doing this but by a direct comparison of the dates of the two events, as nearly as they can be historically, or rather chronologically, determined. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of many of the elements that enter into the settlement of this early portion of both the Egyptian and the biblical chronology forbids any absolute satisfaction on this point. If, however, we may trust to the accuracy of the conclusions arrived at above, we may with tolerable safety set down the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt as continuing B. C. 1874–1658, and the rule of the Hycsos as lasting B. C. 2003–1470; in other words, the entire period of 216 years during which the Hebrews were in Egypt was contemporaneous with that of the Hycsos, and about the middle of the latter.*

The only information we have of the Hycsos from other ancient writers on Egypt consists of such slight notices in the fragments of Manetho as the following, by Africanus: "Fifteenth dynasty—six foreign Phœnician kings, who also took Memphis. They likewise founded a city in the Sethroite nome, advancing from which they reduced the Egyptians to subjection;" "Sixteenth dynasty—thirty other Shepherd-kings;" "Seventeenth dynasty—forty-three other Shepherd-kings, and forty-three Theban Diospolites together." Instead of this Eusebius has simply, "Seventeenth dynasty—(four) foreign Phœnician Shepherd-kings (brothers,) who also took Memphis . . . They founded a city in the Sethroite nome, advancing from which they subdued Egypt."

There are a few indications in the biblical records, which have been mostly overlooked in this discussion, but which to our mind go far toward confirming this relative position of the

* Some writers have claimed (Birch, "Egypt," p. 131) that the name Raamses, (or Rameses,) one of the "treasure cities" built by the Israelites in their period of bondage, (Exod. i, 11,) is conclusive proof that the oppression took place under the Ramessidæ, (nineteenth dynasty, B. C. 1302;) but this is inconsistent with the fact that Goshen is called "the land of Rameses," (Gen. xlvii, 11,) in the time of Joseph, (B.C. 1874.)

two periods. In the first place, we are expressly told that in the time of Joseph "every shepherd was an abomination unto the Egyptians." (Gen. xlvi, 34.) This shows that the Shepherd invasion had occurred before that date, as it seems to be the only reasonable explanation of so deep an abhorrence. In the second place, however, it is clear, not only from the entire narrative, but especially from the fact that the Israelites were placed in Goshen, evidently as a breakwater against these foreign irruptions, that the Hycsos had not yet gained the upper hand, at least in Memphis, where the capital of Joseph's Pharaoh seems to have been located; and this accords with the language of Josephus above, which implies that the capture of Memphis did not occur till an advanced period in the Shepherd line, perhaps the beginning of the sixteenth dynasty. It is true Josephus seems to locate the first Shepherd king at Memphis, but he betrays the inaccuracy of this expression by adding immediately that the king in question built Avaris as his capital; and the table of dynasties shows that the Memphitic dynasty continued till about the beginning of the Shepherd dynasty sixteen. Indeed, the change in the policy of the Egyptians toward the Hebrews, (Exod. i, 8,) which took place B. C. cir. 1738, singularly accords with the revolution in lower Egypt at the end of the eighth dynasty (B. C. 1740) or the beginning of the sixteenth, (B. C. 1755.) Finally, the remark incidentally dropped as a reason by the "new king" for oppressing the Israelites, "Lest, when there falleth out any war, they join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land," which at first sight seems most appropriate in the mouth of one of the regular Memphitic line, bears, when more closely examined, strongly in the opposite direction. So far as joining the enemy is concerned, there could be little difference. The Shepherds are supposed by some to have been naturally friendly toward their neighbors and fellow-shepherds, the Hebrews; but, on the other hand, we know the Hebrews were closely in alliance with the long-established and apparently legitimate native sovereigns—had been so, in fact, ever since the days of Abraham, (Gen. xii, 16;) and since the Hebrews had been located, as we have seen above, in Goshen, expressly for a purpose adverse to the Hycsos, we can hardly suppose that they had

coalesced in sympathy or plans. The tyrant's fear was not so much of the arms of the Hebrews, for they were certainly not formidable soldiers, but rather lest they should seize the opportunity of the existing civil convulsion to *escape from* Egypt. He was not alarmed, it seems, at the prospect of their increasing as an *invading* force, such as were the Hycsos, but only lest their growing numbers should warrant them in migrating bodily to some more comfortable region. This implies that they had already experienced ill treatment or dissatisfaction. From what source could this have arisen? They had the best possible land for their avocation, (Gen. xlvii, 6;) they had enjoyed royal patronage to the full; they had never hitherto been oppressed by government. They had always been peaceable and loyal citizens; why should they now be suspected and constrained? The jealousy, if on the part of the native *regime*, seems inexplicable; and we may add that such a rigorous and illegal course is not in accordance with what we otherwise know of the polity of the legitimate sovereigns of ancient Egypt. We cannot but suspect that bickerings, rivalries, animosity, had long existed between the Hebrews and the lawless, uncultivated Hycsos on their frontier; and raids such as the Israelites afterward experienced from their Bedouin neighbors in Palestine had, doubtless, often been made upon their quiet domain by these Bene-Kedem, as Josephus virtually styles them. It was this annoyance that had tempted the Hebrews to long for a less exposed situation; and when they saw these freebooters installed as lords, they might well think it high time to decamp. The whole conduct of the Hycsos, as revealed by Josephus, shows them to have been of this domineering, foraging, semi-savage character. They were, in fact, congeners of the Canaanites, with whom the Israelites had henceforth a perpetual enmity, despite the traditional comity of earlier days. No genuine Egyptian monarch seems capable of the barbarity of the Pharaoh of the Exodus; but the atrocities which Josephus states that the Hycsos perpetrated in their later invasion justify the belief that it was they who, in the days of their power, made Egypt known as "the house of bondage." The irritation and vexation caused by this system of petty persecution during the long contact of the Israelites with the Hycsos in Egypt cherished as well as disclosed the early purpose of the former

to return to the land of their forefathers, (Gen. i, 25,) and had been predicted of old, (Gen. xv, 13;) but it was not till the domination of the latter had made it galling to an intolerable degree that the resolve ripened into a fixed determination.* Sectional jealousies and tribal animosities of this sort are proverbially hereditary, and are peculiarly inveterate in the East, where they are so liable to be aggravated by blood feuds. We can trace distinct evidences of such a national grudge in this case from the time when the son of the Egyptian bond-woman —who was, doubtless, no other than a captive from these "Sons of the East" bordering on Egypt—was expelled from the Hebrew homestead for mocking the son of the free-woman, (Gen. xxi, 9,) till Moses slew the Egyptian task-master, (Exod. ii, 12.) Hagar naturally retired to the "wilderness of Beersheba," (Gen. xxi, 14,) which was part of what was known by the more general name of the desert of Paran, where her childhood had, doubtless, been spent, and there contracted a marriage for her son among her kindred tribes, called even then part of the land of Egypt, (Gen. xxi, 21.) His descendants, the notorious Ishmaelites, who roved as brigands over the region between Egypt and Canaan, intensified the clannish variance, which became still more sharply defined between the cavalierly Esau and the puritan Jacob in the next generation. These two representative characters, indeed, both went under the common title of shepherds or herdsmen, for flocks and herds constituted the staple of the property of each, (Gen. xxxiii, 9;) but the "cunning hunter of the field" evidently looked with Bedouin dis-

* "The occupation of Egypt by the Hycsos appears to have been, from first to last, military. The fortified camp of Abaris, the possession of Memphis and of various other places throughout Egypt which were garrisoned by them, placed the whole country in their name; but the difference of religion, language, and institutions would prevent any amalgamations between them and a people so peculiarly inflexible in all these relations as the Egyptians were. Their monarchs took care to preserve the military discipline on which the maintenance of their superiority depended; from Memphis, where the seat of their government was established, they visited Abaris every summer, and by military exercises and reviews at once kept up the spirit of the soldiers and made an imposing display of force in the eyes of the natives and foreigners. During the first six reigns a policy of destruction and extermination was pursued; afterward it would seem that, on payment of tribute, the sovereigns of Thebes and Xois were allowed to exercise the powers of royalty, and the people to pursue their labors in peace."—Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ii, p. 164.

dain upon his "simple tent-dwelling" brother as a Fellah, (Gen. xxv, 27, and following.) The collisions between the Philistine herdsmen and Jacob's (Gen. xxv, 17–22) seem to belong to the same line of difference, and may serve to remind us that Philistia, as the intermediate battle-ground of the expelled Hycsos in later times, retained in its military prowess and panoplied champions traces of their warlike encounters with the arms of Egypt. The iron war-chariots of the Canaanites are especially traceable to the Egyptian use of cavalry, and these could only deploy successfully in the level sea-coast and its connected plains. The fear of encountering these disciplined foes on the part of the Israelites in their departure from Egypt betrays the hereditary hostility between them. The Amalekites, who attacked the Hebrews in the desert, (Exod. xvii, 8,) were evidently a branch of the same roving race of Arabs in the northern part of the peninsula of Sinai, and they repeated the attack at the southern border of Canaan. (Num. xiv, 45.) The ban of eventual extermination against them (Exod. xvii, 16) was but the renewal of the old enmity. It was a caravan of these gypsy traders (indifferently called Ishmaelites or Midianites, Gen. xxxviii, 28,) who purchased Joseph and carried him to their comrades in Egypt.

The second irruption of the Hycsos into Egypt, as narrated by Josephus, manifestly was, when stripped of its apocryphal exaggerations, merely one of the forays which characterized, or rather constituted, the guerrilla system seen on various occasions to have prevailed on the southern border of Palestine, such as Saul's raid against Amalek, (1 Sam. xv. 3,) David's expeditions from Ziklag, (1 Sam. xxvii, 8,) and the later marauds of the Simeonites. (1 Chron. v, 18–22.)* The date assigned to it by Josephus would be about B. C. 1170–50, or during the troubled judgeship of Eli, when the Philistines and other aborigines had every thing pretty much their own way. This was some three centuries after the close of the Shepherd rule in

* Josephus repeatedly says that this latter invasion of the Hycsos continued during a space of thirteen years. Osburn summarily disposes of the whole account of the Shepherd-kings as a fiction, or at best a mere travesty of the rule of the native princes of Lower Egypt. The monuments, of course, would be sparing of allusion to the intruders, as they also ignore the Hebrews and the overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea.

Egypt, which ended about B. C. 1492, or during the judgeship of Ehud. As the route of the invading and retreating hordes was, of course, along the sea-coast, they may have marched and countermarched freely at any time prior to David's reign without disturbing in the least the current of Hebrew annals, which at that period are confined to the mountain back-bone of the country and the Jordan valley.

In conclusion, it may not be amiss to notice a few of the synchronisms given by the ancient writers cited above between Egyptian and Hebrew history, although these seem to be but inferences derived by each from his own special system. Manetho, as cited by Josephus, evidently confounded the first as well as the second expulsion of the Hycsos with the exodus; it is not clear that Josephus himself accepted either date for that event.* Yet many chronologers, including Dr. Jarvis, have adopted this coincidence as the pivotal point of their schemes. Africanus, however, in his abstract from Manetho, does explicitly make the departure of Moses out of Egypt fall under Amosis, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty. Our own date for that king's accession (B. C. 1492) differs very little from Usher's date of the exodus, (B. C. 1491.) On the other hand, Eusebius places the exodus in the reign of Achencheres (Acherhres I. of Africanus), the successor of Horus, which latter reigned, according to our dates, (B. C. 1339–1302;) but Acherhres and several following names in both Eusebius and Africanus have been supposed, according to the monuments, to be those of foreign princes who usurped the throne during a part of Horus's reign.† Eusebius, it must be remembered, has deranged the chronology of this portion of his list by in-

* The reasoning of Josephus is quite self-contradictory on this point. He quarrels with Manetho for confounding the Israelites with the Hycsos, and yet himself seems to admit their identity. He was evidently too angry to argue well.

† Josephus gives this name as Acencheres, the *daughter* of Horus, followed by her brother. Osburn, who claims he has read the name of Achencheres on the monuments, (Mon. Hist., p. i, 185 *seq.*,) makes him out to be a son and co-regent of Mephre, the fourth king before Horus. The repetition of the name betrays some confusion, and probably corruption. As there is much intricacy here, we subjoin a table elucidating the subject. It will be observed that toward the close of the list Josephus falls into another inadvertence. He twice (*Ap.*, i, 15, 26) says that the eighteenth dynasty amounts to 393 years, in which he evidently has by mistake included the reign of Rhampses, of dynasty nineteen; yet (*ibid.*, 26) he adds this reign again,

serting this dynasty (the eighteenth) immediately after the fourth king (Aphophis) of the first dynasty (fifteen, which he reckons as seventeen) of the Shepherds. Adjusting our dates by this transposition, we would have B. C. 1701–1664 for the reign of Horus, (including that of Achencherses,) which very nearly embraces the exodus, (B. C. 1658, as we place it.) Finally, Syncellus makes the king under whom Joseph ruled in Egypt to have been Aphobis, of the fifteenth Shepherd dynasty; and he states that all authorities (apparently only Eratosthenes, as reported by Apollodorus) agree in this synchronism. According to our dates Joseph was promoted B. C. 1883, and died B. C. 1857; and Aphobis reigned B. C. 1914–1854, covering the whole period of Joseph's life in Egypt.*

together with that of Sethos, in order to make up his full number of 518 years. His list, as the table shows, is disordered at this point.

MANETHO'S LIST OF THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH DYNASTIES.

| Dynasty. | No. | Josephus. | Yrs. | Mos. | No. | Africanus. | Yrs. | No. | Eusebius. | Yrs. Gr. | Yrs. Arm. | Monuments. | Yrs. | B.C. cir. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XVIII | 1 | Tethmosis, | 25 | 4 | 1 | Amos, | | 1 | Amosis, | 25 | 25 | Ames, | 23 | 1492 |
| " | 3 | Amenophis, | 20 | 7 | 2 | Amenophthis, | 24 | 2 | Ammenophis, | 21 | 21 | Amenoph I., | | 1470 |
| " | 2 | Chebron, | 13 | | 3 | Chebros, | 13 | 3 | Chebron, | 13 | 13 | Thotmes I. | | 1457 |
| " | 4 | Amesses, | 21 | 9 | 4 | Amesesis, | 22 | | | | | Thotmes II., | 2 | 1444 |
| " | 5 | Mephres, | 12 | 9 | 5 | Misaphris, | 13 | 4 | Miphres, | 12 | 12 | Thotmes III., | 47 | 1442 |
| " | 6 | Mephramuthosis, | 25 | 10 | 6 | Misphragmuthosis, | 26 | 5 | Misphragmuthosis, | 26 | 26 | Amenoph II., | 6 | 1838 |
| " | 7 | Thmosis, | 9 | 8 | 7 | Tuthmosis, | 9 | 6 | Tuthmosis, | 9 | 9 | Thotmes IV., | 7 | 1382 |
| " | 8 | Amenophis, | 30 | 10 | 8 | Amenophis, | 31 | 7 | Amenophis, | 31 | 31 | Amenoph III., | 36 | 1375 |
| " | 9 | Oros, | 36 | 5 | 9 | Oros, | 37 | 8 | Oros, | 36 38 | 28 | Horus, | | 1339 |
| " | 10 | Acencheres, | 12 | 1 | 10 | Acherbres, | 32 | 9 | Acencheres, | 16 | 16 | | | |
| " | 11 | Phatholis, | 9 | | 11 | Phathos, | 6 | | | 12 | | | | |
| " | 12 | Acenchres, | 12 | 5 | 12 | Chebres, | 12 | 10 | Acherbres. | 8 | 8 | | | |
| " | 13 | Acencheres, | 12 | 3 | 13 | Acherbres, | 12 | 11 | Cherbres, | 15 | 15 | | | |
| " | 14 | Armais, | 4 | 1 | 14 | Armeses, | 5 | 12 | Armais, | 5 | 5 | | | |
| " | 15 | Pharnesses, | 1 | 4 | 15 | Pharmeses, | 1 | | | | | Rameses I., | 2 | 1302 |
| XIX. | 1 | Sethosis, | 59 | | 1 | Sethos, | 51 | 1 | Sethos, | 55 | 55 | Sethos I., | | 1300 |
| | 2 | Phampses, | 66 | | 2 | Phapsaces, | 61 | 2 | Rhampses, | 66 | 66 | Rameses II., | 62 | 1249 |
| XVIII | 17 | Amenophis, | 19 | 6 | 16 | Amenophath, | 19 | 14 | Amenophis, | 40 | 40 | Menephtah I., | | 1183 |
| XIX. | | | | | 3 | Amenephthes, | 20 | 3 | Ammenephthis | 40 | 8 | Menephtah II., | | 1175 |
| " | | | | | 5 | Ammenemnes | 5 | 4 | Ammenemes, | 26 | 25 | (?)Sethos II., | | |
| " | | | | | 6 | Thuoris, | 7 | 5 | Thuoris, | 7 | 7 | (?)Sethos III., | | |
| | XVIII 16 | Armesses-Miammun, | 60 | 2 | XIX. 4 | Rhameses, | 60 | | | | | Rameses III., | 26 | 1155 |

*An interesting confirmation of this chronological position of the Hebrews' transmigration is found in the fact that *horses* do not appear on the Egyptian monuments prior to the eighteenth dynasty, (Wilkinson, "Ancient Egyptians," i, p. 386, Am. ed..) having, in all probability, been introduced by the Bedouin Hycsos, of whom, however, few, if any, pictorial representations remain. Accordingly, at the removal of the Israelites to Egypt, in the early part of the Shepherd rule, we read only of asses and wagons for transportation, (Gen. xiv, 19–23,) the latter, no doubt, for oxen, like those employed in the desert, (Num. vii, 3;) but at the exode, in the latter part of the Shepherd rule, the cavalry, consisting exclusively of chariots, formed an important arm of the military service. (Exod. xiv, 7.) The incidental mention of horses, however, in Gen. xlviii, 17, as a part of

## Art. VI.—BIBLE WINES.

The Scripture wine question presents itself to us in the first instance simply as a question of biblical archæology. As such it is naturally divided into two sections, answering to the two great divisions of the Bible, the one of which comes to us in the Hebrew language, and the other in the Greek. To the first of these, as being the most fundamental, this article is restricted.

Is it certain, or highly probable, that the use of alcoholic wine is mentioned in Scripture with approval, either expressed or implied? That *wine* is so mentioned all agree; but is the case such as to compel or warrant the belief that this wine was alcoholic? The overwhelming majority of biblical scholars so affirm; indeed, it is only in the present century that this view has come to be seriously questioned. Even at the present time one could almost count upon his fingers the names of all so eminent as to be recognized in any sense as authorities in any department of biblical learning, whether lexicography, archæology, or exegesis, who express dissent from this view. In this nearly all commentators agree, whether of the present or past ages, whether of one type of culture and belief or another. Indeed, the principal exceptions that can now be made to this statement are among those smaller commentaries intended for popular use, by far the best and most learned of which is that of Dr. Whedon. All Bible dictionaries, cyclopedias, and works of archæology which are of recognized authority agree in this. Exceptions, it is true, there may be found, but they will be among the smaller works of this class, intended for special uses. There is also one notable exception to this general statement, with which the public are widely familiar, that of the first edition of Kitto's Cyclopedia, four articles for which, bearing on this subject, were written by the distinguished temperance advocate, Dr. Lees. But the fact that when this work was revised and enlarged, under the editorship of Dr.

farm stock in certain parts of the country, at a somewhat later date than Jacob's migration, and of chariots at his funeral, (Gen. 1, 8,) materially weakens the force of this coincidence. Herodotus says (ii, 108) that horses and chariots were in use before the time of Sesostris the Great, by whom he probably means Rameses II., (B. C. 1249.)

W. L. Alexander, these articles were all substituted by others, advocating other views, detracts from the significance of this exception.

What is true of books of reference on the Bible is also true of works of general reference. The great body of these do not betray the slightest consciousness that the word wine is ever used in any other sense than as the name of a fermented liquor. Take as specimens of these, the Encyclopedia Brittanica, Appletons' Cyclopedia, Chambers', Rees', Smith's Dictionary of Grecian and Roman Antiquities, Brand's Dictionary of Science and Art, etc., etc. Webster's Dictionary is no exception, nor Worcester's. Indeed, all the dictionaries in current use of all the languages in which, and with respect to which, our inquiries on this subject must be conducted, seem to agree in treating wine, and the words answering to it—in the Latin, the Greek, the Hebrew, the Syriac, and the Arabic languages—as names of a fermented liquor.

If we turn for information to those who in our time have had personal acquaintance with Bible lands, and the peoples who most nearly represent those of the Bible, we are met by a similar body of testimony. Dr. Eli Smith, for more than a score of years missionary in Syria, the most noted wine region among the lands of the Bible—the man to whom that as yet unequaled book, Robinson's "Researches," is largely indebted for its minute and accurate information, and so a most competent witness—says: "Unintoxicating wines I have not been able to hear of. All wines, they say, intoxicate more or less. When inquiring for unfermented wine I have uniformly been met with a stare of surprise. The very idea seems to be regarded as an absurdity."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, page 388.

Dr. Van Dyck, the eminent Arabic scholar and translator of the Bible into that language, who has been pronounced more familiar with the customs and life of the people of Syria than any other foreigner, says: "There is not, and, so far as I can find out, never was, any thing like what has been called unfermented wine. The thing is not known in the East. Syrup is made from the juice of the grape and molasses; but nothing that is called wine is unfermented. They have no unfermented drinks but water of licorice root. Raisins are sometimes soaked till they swell, and then eaten and the water

drank; but it is never called wine, or supposed to be related to wine.

"The native Churches—Evangelical, Maronite, Greek, Coptic, and Armenian—all use fermented wine at communion. They have no other, and have no idea of any other.

"The Jews not only use fermented wine at their feasts, but use it to great excess, especially at the feast of Purim, when, according to the Talmud, a man is bound to get so drunk with wine as not to know the difference between 'Cursed be Haman' and 'Blessed be Mordecai.' At the Passover only fermented wine is used. As I said before, there is no other, and they have no idea of any other."—*Bibliotheca Sacra, January*, 1869.

Dr. Justin Perkins, in his work, "Residence of Eight Years in Persia," speaks at some length of the wines of Persia, but the substance of his testimony is comprehended in a single sentence, which I quote: "The wines in Persia are, in general, much lighter than those in Europe, but they are still always intoxicating."—Page 234.

Rev. Benjamin Larabee, Jun., who has been for many years missionary among the Nestorians, writes to his father, Dr. Larabee, late President of Middlebury College, Vermont: "With the most careful inquiries I have been unable to learn that any wine is ever manufactured in the country which is not intoxicating. The various kinds made differ, more or less, in their intoxicating powers, but all are fermented, and all, sooner or later, produce the same effect. The unfermented juice of the grape is never used as a beverage. The very Syriac word for wine signifies, by its etymology, fermented."

Rev. J. H. Shedd, missionary at Oroomiah, Persia, in a communication to the "Interior," of July 20, 1871, speaks of an experience of eleven years in the East, and says: "The most diligent inquiries of those on the ground, and most familiar with the people in Turkey and Persia, can find no unfermented wine. *The people know nothing of the luxury spoken of by classical writers*, and nothing of any method of preserving the juice of the grape from becoming intoxicating. The testimony of all familiar with the East is the same."

Rev. Henry Homes, American missionary at Constantinople, in his most able and instructive article on the "Produce of the Vineyard in the East," says; "All that is called wine in the

East is as truly wine as that which is called wine in France. Whether boiled or not, whether sweet or sour, all the known wines are intoxicating."—*Bibliotheca Sacra, May*, 1848.

If, from commentaries, works of reference, and individual testimony, we turn for light to the self-repeating religious observances of the people of these lands, we find a similar state of facts. Dr. Eli Smith, in the article above referred to, says: "In regard to the wine used at the Sacrament, I have questioned both Papal and Greek priests, and received the same answer. It must, they say, be perfect, pure wine. If unfermented it will not answer, nor will it if the acetous fermentation be commenced. The acknowledgment of the necessity of fermentation by the Papists is worthy of special notice, inasmuch as they reject fermented bread. This rejection is owing to their belief that our Saviour used unleavened bread at the institution of the ordinance; and their admission of fermented wine, consequently, indicates a belief that he used fermented wine, notwithstanding it was the feast of unleavened bread. To this, so far as I have observed, the custom of the Jews in Palestine now corresponds."

The testimony of Dr. Van Dyck has already been quoted, and is equally positive and definite, both as to Jewish and Christian usage. And that this practice of the Jews is not the result of any very modern degeneracy is shown by the testimony of the Mishna, the oldest non-biblical authority in the matter of Jewish customs. "It is commanded that this rite be performed with red wine." In another place it says "that water is mixed with wine because it is too strong to be drunk alone." The Jerusalem Talmud speaks of being "merry with wine" at this feast; and "to meet the question, How can intoxication be hindered? the rabbins replied, 'Wine between eating does not intoxicate a man.'" In the light of many sentences of this character, which have been culled from the Talmud, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that, in the centuries just following the beginning of our era, the Passover wine was frequently, if not universally, of an intoxicating quality.

Such is a plain and honest statement of the case. It will certainly not be profitable, but, on the contrary, most harmful, to allow it to be disguised in any of its features. Neither lamentations nor maledictions can change it. Instead, then, of be-

wailing or misrepresenting the opinions that others have been led to form on this subject, let us accept them as what they really are, not decisive authority, indeed, but at most only helpful suggestion. Our work is not to change the immutable past to make it harmonize with our present ideas of policy and right; but by wisdom and faith, candor and courage, patience and self-sacrifice, to bring in a better future, as, by the grace of God, we can and will do. And yet, as this better future must come out of our Bible somehow, it is still natural and proper that we should turn to it with devout and earnest inquiry, in the spirit of the scholar and the faith of the Christian—that we should again place it in the crucible of criticism, to see whether, after all, it may not have been misrepresented;—whether its divine utterances, as they have been echoed back to us from this great cloud of witnesses, have not been misunderstood, and so misinterpreted.

As has been already said, this is primarily a question of archæology, and must be determined by testimony. This testimony we must find without us and not within us. We cannot evolve it from the depths of consciousness or conscience, but we must bring it from those sources where, in the providence of God, it exists. Now, there are three great sources of original information on such a subject: 1. The present prevailing customs in the lands of the Bible, and among the peoples which represent most nearly those of the Bible. These we have already referred to, but may take occasion to allude to them again. 2. The ancient customs of the Jews, as preserved in the most ancient non-biblical literature. The great work in this category is that to which allusion has already been made, namely, the Jewish Talmud. 3. But the one grand source of information is the original text of the Old Testament, and to this we now reverently make appeal. And we turn to it, fully recognizing and frankly admitting the practical unanimity with which biblical scholars of all ages, sects, and nationalities have decided as to the honorable place which Scripture gives to fermented wine—a unanimity which is even now but slightly broken. But we turn to the Bible as just as really the standard of appeal in the case as though nothing else had ever been written. We are bound to respect the opinions of the most competent scholars and witnesses on this subject. We

cannot afford to be uncandid or intolerant. This is a question of fact and not of feeling. And it must be admitted that on most questions of this nature such an array of human authorities agreeing would be practically decisive; but in this matter there are some considerations which come in to break the force and positiveness of the conclusions which so many have reached. Some of these it is the object of this article to set forth, rather in the way of suggestion than of full and positive affirmation.

1. First, then, in seeking to understand the real facts of the case, it is proper to direct attention to the peculiar character of the Hebrew language. It contains, as is well known, comparatively few words, and hence the general belief is that its capabilities of expression are very limited. But the fact is that in certain departments of human thought and experience few languages are so expressive. A language that has more than sixty different words for "break," a still larger number for "go," and more than one hundred for "take," no one of which is the exact synonym of another, must delight in fine distinctions. Who does not see that in translating a hundred different Hebrew words by "take," as is actually done in our version, there must be many shades of meaning lost. This English word must, of course, be, in a majority of these instances, more or less inaccurate as a translation. It must give some words more meaning than they really have, others less, and all, to some extent, a different meaning. Hence, in such cases we must miss in the English version the exact force of the original.

Such is the case before us. Eleven Hebrew words, no one of which is a synonym of another, are rendered by one and the same English word, wine. Some of these, it is true, are also rendered by other words, but the most important of these are quite uniformly rendered wine. Now, it is patent on the surface of this matter that we have lost distinctions expressed in the original, and there is certainly a possibility that the absence of these distinctions is a source of obscurity and difficulty. We talk about "wine," but the Old Testament treats of *yayin*, *tirosh*, *shekar*, *sope*, etc., no one of which words may be exactly represented by the English word "wine."

2. Every one who has given attention to the matter knows the special difficulty of ascertaining certainly and accurately the meaning of words in the Old Testament applied to objects

an natural history. Some of these words have not been in use since the Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language, that is, for more than two thousand years; and as there has been maintained in this land no continuous national life, and no regular succession of literature, in many instances the meaning of these words is almost hopelessly lost. For fifteen hundred years the Church has been discussing the identity of Jonah's gourd, and yet without agreement to this day. The "rose of Sharon" and the "lily of the valley" have gone widely into all forms of Christian literature; but there is even now no unanimity among scholars as to the plants intended. The cistus, crocus, mallow, hollyhock, and, by most, the narcissus, have all been selected for the former; while at least an equal number of candidates have been brought forward for the honor of being identified with the latter. So difficult is it, even in such notable examples, to make sure of the natural history of the Bible. This consideration bears legitimately on this subject, though not with full force. We are prosecuting an inquiry touching this very class of objects, without the helps that come from a continuous succession of witnesses either in life or literature. There is, then, here a special liability to error, and this fact should make us modest in our affirmations.

The effort to procure relief at this point by seeking testimonies and illustrations from the luxurious periods of Grecian and Roman civilization has but increased the embarrassment. The types of life in these nations were widely distinct from that of the Hebrew people, and on questions of this character it is particularly unsafe to reason from the one to the other.

3. We come now to a consideration that bears upon this whole question with peculiar significance. It is evident from the Old Testament that the vine was one of the most characteristic and higly esteemed of the productions of the Holy Land. Numerous passages might be cited to illustrate this, but it is not necessary to use space for this purpose. No careful reader of the Bible will question the truth of this statement. Now, all the manufactured products of the vine are called in our English Bible "wine" and "honey;" this last word being used with this application in not more than half a score of instances, while wine is used more than two hundred times. The impression, then, which we receive from the English Old Testa-

ment is that the one grand product of the vine is what we call wine. So exclusively is this the case that nothing else comes into our thought; vine and wine are practically equivalents.

But the fact now is that what is commonly called wine, namely, the fermented juice of the grape, is neither the sole product of the vine, nor by any means the most important. Dr. Eli Smith, in the article already twice quoted, says: "Wine is not the most important, but rather the least so, of all the objects for which the vine is cultivated." And again, in speaking of a particular locality, "The wine made is an item of no consideration." Dr. Robinson says: "No wine is made from the very extensive vineyards of Hebron, except a very little by the Jews." Rev. Henry Homes, in the excellent article already mentioned, on the "Produce of the Vineyard in the East," specifies sixteen different classes of products of the vine. He says: "The largest part of the produce of the vine is used for other purposes than making intoxicating liquors." He finds this to be true, not only among Moslems, to whom wine is interdicted, but also among Jews and Christians, who drink it without scruple. He is led to conclude that, on account of the influence of travelers, and the corruption and degradation of the people, the amount of wine now made is greater than at any former period, but even now it is proportionately small. And yet he says, "In the vine-growing districts of Turkey the grape stands as prominent among the productions of the country as a source of comfort and prosperity as the Bible makes it to have been among the productions of Judea."

Now, this serious discrepancy between the facts as they now are in Bible lands, and the facts as they are made to appear in our English version, plainly points to the conclusion that in the latter we fail to see the case as it really was—that wine as an alcoholic liquor has an undue prominence in that body of biblical interpretation to which reference has already been made. Eastern life is practically immutable. What we see to-day doubtless gives a very accurate suggestion of what might have been seen three thousand years ago. Hence the present state of the case, as attested by such thoroughly competent witnesses as have been already cited, and multitudes of others who might be quoted, creates a strong presumption against the view which has been most widely held. It is absolutely incredible that in

this regard there should have been such a radical revolution as this would imply.

4. Coming to the particular facts in the case, as exhibited in the original words translated wine, we shall have little occasion for extended discussion of Hebrew etymologies, or for a microscopic scrutiny of particular passages. Sufficient for this are the lexicons and the commentaries, and the many monographs which have been written on this general subject. The state of the case is about as fairly within the range of a careful and critical student of the English Bible as of the Hebrew scholar. Eleven Hebrew words are translated wine, and two others not so translated deserve notice in this connection. Arranging these in the general order of their occurrence, they are: יַיִן (*yayin*,) 140; תִּירוֹשׁ (*tirosh*,) 38; שֵׁכָר (*shekar*,) which occurs in the noun form 23 times, and in the verb form 19; חֶמֶר (*khemer*,) and its cognate in the Chaldee, 10; עָסִיס (*ahsees*,) 5; שְׁמָרִים (*shemarim*,) 5; סֹבֶא (*sobe*,) as a noun 3, as a verb 6; אֲשִׁישָׁה (*ashishah*,) 4; עֲנָבִים (*anavim*,) as wine 1, as grapes 16; יְקֶב (*yekeb*,) as wine 1, as a wine-press, 16; מִמְסָךְ (*mimsak*,) 1. In addition to these words rendered wine, there are two others which are applied to the manufactured product of the vine, namely, חֹמֶץ (*khometz*,) "vinegar," which occurs 6 times, and דְּבַשׁ (*d$^{e}$bash*,) (dibs,) rendered "honey." This occurs 54 times, in only two of which occurrences does it certainly mean dibs. Thus does it appear that one of these words occurs 140 times, another 38, and yet that the aggregate of the occurrences of all the words in this list, except the first, in noun form, is scarcely more than 100. Now the question is, *Do these figures indicate that this word, which occurs* 140 *times, is used in a sense broad and generic, or one narrow and specific?* Present usage indicates that the sense of fermented liquor is one of the narrowest and least important which the subject furnishes, and yet we have every reason to believe, that because of the influence of foreign travelers, this sense is more prominent than in the ancient time; is it credible that this one word, which is so conspicuous in our Hebrew Bibles, is applied exclusively in a sense so restricted and special? That it is repeatedly used in this sense no one will deny; the question is, Is it invariably used in this sense? If it be urged that the etymology of יַיִן (*yayin*,)

is decisive, because, according to Gesenius, it comes from a root which means, "*to boil up, to be in a ferment,*" and so it must always include in its contents the idea of fermentation, we reply that Fürst, who, in etymology, is greatly superior to Gesenius, does not concur in this view, but finds in the root of the word an allusion to the manner in which the juice is obtained from the grape, (יִרַן, *to tread the grapes,*) a view which gives the word breadth enough to cover all the manufactured products of the vine. If it is ever employed for the grape itself, as without doubt it is, (see Jer. xl, 10,) this is by that very common figure of rhetoric, metonomy, and in no way affects the case.

Practically, however, this inquiry may be limited to three of these words, namely, יַיִן (*yayin,*) which occurs 140 times; תִּירוֹשׁ (*tirosh,*) which occurs 38 times; and שֵׁכָר (*shekar,*) which occurs 23 times. The last is steadily used in a bad sense, and with implied reprobation, as is also the cognate verb, which is used nineteen times. True, it is included in the system of religious offerings, but this fact is significant rather of its value than of its use as by men. תִּירוֹשׁ (*tirosh,*) on the other hand, is used in a good sense, frequently keeping company with corn and oil. The only apparent exception is Hos. iv, 11: "Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart," where the general thought is the imbruting influence of appetite; and the combination points most significantly to that state of degradation in which all things minister to fleshliness and sensuality. יַיִן (*yayin,*) is used in both senses, now as a blessing, and now as a curse. Now this שֵׁכָר (*shekar,*) which is reprobated, is beyond all question an intoxicating liquor; while תִּירוֹשׁ (*tirosh,*) which is found so uniformly in good company, is, with strong probability, as even Fürst concludes, not alcoholic. *Does not this appear significant of the principle on which this classification was made?* Does it not lend plausibility to the conjecture, even if it be nothing more than conjecture, that it is with reference to this very distinction that *yayin* is sometimes approved and sometimes condemned?

5. This general presumption is strengthened by another class of very important facts. The law of the Nazarite (Num. vi, 1–21) required abstinence from all the products of the vine,

which in the third verse are enumerated in the use of seven different terms and phrases. A similar prohibition, though less rigid in its conditions, was made to officiating priests. Individuals elected to important functions, as the wife of Manoah and the mother of Samuel, were similarly restrained. The family of Jehonadab maintained in this way a practical protest against the sweeping flood of heathen luxury and corruption for two centuries and a half, and obtained from Jehovah this remarkable vindication: "Because ye have done this, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever." Jer. xxxv, 18, 19. Now, without discussing *in extenso* these cases, every one of which is most significant, is it not clear that they constitute in the aggregate a divinely-directed protest against that which intoxicates? Manifestly, the reason for interdicting indifferent and innocent things, as in the case of the Nazarite, was to testify most effectually against this one evil thing, just as the innocent earth, with all it contains, is cursed for the sake of man, its guilty head.

6. But, finally, if it be said that in this rudimentary stage in the development of God's kingdom among men, and in these exceedingly simple conditions, there was not, in this as in other matters, so clear a line of demarkation between the good and the bad, the wholesome and the hurtful, as in the better developed and more Christian type of this kingdom, we have nothing to object to such a view. Indeed, this is quite in harmony with God's usual method of procedure in the spiritual discipline of man. In specific cases, such as have been already mentioned, he puts before us the *ideal* of consecrated living, which ideal shall be fully and generally realized only when "Holiness to the Lord" shall be written even upon "the bells of the horses."

## Art. VII.—TYERMAN'S LIFE OF WHITEFIELD.

The "Life of Whitefield," by Rev. L. Tyerman, which has recently appeared, is a work of twelve hundred pages. It is contained in two volumes, and is adorned with two portraits of the great preacher, one of which represents him at the age of twenty-four years, and the other at the age of fifty-four.

There is much in these volumes which is familiar; there is also much that is new; and it seems to be no empty boast of Mr. Tyerman that he has spared "neither time, toil, nor money" in gathering his materials. He has brought to light some interesting documents. The work is clearly written, though without any claim to high literary excellence. Its main fault is that it is too voluminous. The happy arts of omission and condensation might have been carried to a further extent, and the value of the work would have been thereby increased. Pages are filled with financial statements about the Orphan House in Georgia, which have no interest to the reader. There are entirely too many quotations from worthless and forgotten pamphlets concerning Whitefield. A few quotations were proper; but only a few.

These, however, are minor criticisms. We owe the author a debt of gratitude that he has given to us so satisfactory an account of the greatest of modern evangelists. And we trust that we shall perform some slight service to our readers if, with the aid of the additional materials before us, we give a sketch of one whose mighty eloquence stirred scores of thousands in the last century, and the result of whose labors are felt in England and America even at the present time.

George Whitefield was born in the Bell Inn, Gloucester, England, in the year 1714. All that we know of his early years is the account which he has given of himself. This curious piece of biography was written when he was but twenty-five years of age. It was written with great frankness, and contains some expressions which laid him open to severe criticisms. He felt the justice of some of these criticisms, for in after years he revised this juvenile performance, and struck out many passages. "Joseph," he said, quoting from Matthew

Henry's Commentary, "had more honesty than he had policy, or he would never have told his dreams."

Mr. Tyerman publishes this account in full, as it was originally written. In this he has done a wise thing; for we wish to see Whitefield as he was; we wish to see alike his weakness and his strength. "Paint me as I am," said Oliver Cromwell to the court painter; "if you leave out the wrinkles I shall not give you a shilling." It was thus that Whitefield painted himself.

In the year 1732 he went to Oxford, and was entered, at the age of seventeen, as a student of Pembroke College. The year was an eventful one in his life. He became deeply interested in Law's "Serious Call to a Devout Life." The next year he became acquainted with John and Charles Wesley and their companions. Then he passed through a great spiritual struggle, which brought him to a bed of sickness; he had "fightings without and fears within;" he fasted and prayed and wept and passed sleepless nights. At last the clouds broke, the light dawned, the storm rolled away, and he enjoyed sweet rest and peace. He was "a new creature in Christ Jesus."

He was ordained by Bishop Benson in the year 1736, when only twenty-one years of age. At this time he seems to have had no idea of the greatness which he was afterward to attain. He was, indeed, eager to preach, and yet he shrank from entering upon the solemn work of the ministry while he was so young. "I have prayed a thousand times,' he said, "till the sweat has dropped from my face like rain, that God of his infinite mercy would not let me enter the Church before he called me. I am unfit to preach in thy great name. Send me not, Lord; send me not yet." And yet the singular history of the first sermon which he wrote ought to have encouraged him. He sent this sermon to a neighboring clergyman as a proof of his unfitness for the work of preaching. Two weeks later the clergyman returned it with his thanks and a guinea, and said that he had divided it, and preached a part of it to his congregation in the morning, and the other part in the evening.

The first sermon of Whitefield was preached at Gloucester in the presence of the friends of his childhood. Curiosity drew a large congregation. The sermon was on "The Necessity and Benefit of Religious Society"—certainly an important subject—

and contains a bold denunciation of worldly assemblies. Such an impression was made by its delivery that an unfriendly critic made haste to convey to the Bishop the astonishing news that it "drove fifteen people mad."

And now Whitefield entered upon that wonderful ministry of thirty-four years, during which he preached more than eighteen thousand sermons to great congregations in Great Britain and America. The churches could not hold the multitudes which flocked to hear him, and he often spoke in the open air. He swayed all classes by his mighty power as a pulpit orator. Traditions of his eloquence remain, and are hard to credit, though well authenticated. At Bristol the people, in their eagerness to hear the "boy parson," climbed on the roof, and clung to the rails of the organ-loft. In London they rose before dawn, and hastened to the early morning service; and Kennington Common would be filled with a great crowd of hearers. In Scotland large congregations were moved as never before or since. At Cambuslang during a sermon "thousands," it is said, "were bathed in tears, some wringing their hands, others almost swooning, and others crying out and mourning over a pierced Saviour." At Cheltenham, where the church doors were closed against Whitefield, he stood on a tombstone, and preached with such energy and pathos that the people wept aloud, and he had to pause until the people could restrain their feelings so as to hear him.

The same remarkable power attended his ministry in America, as in England. At Charleston the reformation extended from morals to manners. Jewelers and dancing masters cried out that their crafts were in danger. In Philadelphia, which then had a population of ten thousand, it seemed as though all the people were becoming religious, and psalm singing could be heard in every house. In Boston, "the capital of New England, and the biggest city in America," he preached his farewell sermon on the Common to twenty-three thousand hearers. "In this town," says a letter-writer of the day, "whoever goes to lessen Mr. Whitefield's reputation is in danger of losing his own."

The best evidence of Whitefield's power is the effect which it had upon what writers used to call "the polite world." It is not so strange that he moved the religious class by his earnest

utterances of truth, or that his gestures, vehemence, resounding voice, humor, and tears should rivet the attention of a London mob, of Kingswood colliers, of Charleston negroes, or of Boston mechanics. Evangelists since his day have shown something of his power in these respects. But it is a marvelous proof of his unrivaled oratory that he should win the admiration of worldly wits, of selfish statesmen, of scoffing skeptics—of all of that brilliant throng of eminent men and of beautiful women which filled the Gothic Chapel at Bath, or the stately rooms of the London mansion of the Countess of Huntingdon. Chesterfield said that Whitefield's eloquence was unrivaled, and the infidel writer, Bolingbroke, that it was the most commanding that he had ever heard. Hume and Franklin, who were not in sympathy with his doctrines, sounded his praises. Among the number of celebrated hearers was Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, a woman whose beauty, wit, and social position made her influence scarcely less than that of the Queen of England, and whose violent temper increased with age. "God knows," she says in one of her letters, "that we all need mending, and none more than myself."

Nor were the effects of this "prince of preachers," as Toplady calls him, as transient as a cloud. They were profound and permanent. In that great revival which the graceful pen of Stevens has so well recorded, Whitefield was, under God, a prominent agent. It was his voice which rebuked sin in high places and in low places, which roused a sleeping Church to action, and bade sinners every-where repent. The number of converts under his ministry is unknown. It was estimated that forty thousand persons were converted in New England alone, and New England was but a small part of the field of his labors. Many of his converts entered the ministry, and thus widely extended his influence. Among these was Thomas Olivers, who was "a brand plucked from the burning," and whose noble hymn, "Lo! He comes, with clouds descending," will live as long as the English language. There were also Robinson, who was in his day a great Baptist preacher in Cambridge, England; and Burder, whose "Village Sermons" have been widely read; and Thomas Rankin, one of Wesley's most useful preachers; and John Fawcett, who preached among the Yorkshire hills for fifty-four years, and wrote that sweet hymn,

"Blest be the tie that binds;" and Dr. Samuel Cooper, who was in his day the popular preacher of Boston, and who in old Brattle-street Church, before a great congregation, pronounced a great eulogy on his spiritual father.

We have no room to trace in detail the wonderful career of Whitefield. His sermons never lacked hearers. At first he met in some places with opposition, and was greeted with curses and stones. In numerous pamphlets cruel and indecent slanders were circulated against him. All that malice and jealousy and envy and falsehood could do was done to put him down, but he lived and conquered by the truth which he preached, until his progress was peaceful and triumphant. Nor did his popularity cease, until, worn out, not with age, but with excessive toil, he preached his last sermon—a sermon of two hours in length—and fell in death as falls a warrior on the field of battle, with his armor on.

Beyond question he was one of the greatest of orators. Art had done something for him, but nature had done much more. His personal appearance was not remarkable. He was somewhat above the middle size, of fair complexion, of regular features, and had a slight defect in one of his eyes, which led the low comedian, Foote, to ridicule him under the name of Dr. Squintum. As he stood on his "pulpit throne," robed in a black gown, and his head covered with the long flowing wig which was then in fashion, he looked like many an ordinary preacher of that day. But when he began to speak attention was arrested. His voice was so loud that it could be heard at times a distance of a mile, and its tones were clear and musical. Garrick, who was no mean judge of elocution, said that he could move an audience to smiles or tears by his varied pronunciations of the word Mesopotamia. "I would give a hundred guineas," he declared, "if I could say 'Oh!' like Mr. Whitefield." Many times the great preacher would give with startling effect the cry of Jeremiah, "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord!" and when he would exclaim, "Hark! hark!" the vast congregation would be hushed in silence. On one occasion he preached from his favorite text, "Ye must be born again," and closed a most affecting sermon by uttering, in a way which made an indelible impression, a quotation from Solomon's Song, which, it would seem, was not calculated to

produce any effect whatever, "Awake, O north wind; and come, thou south; blow upon this garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Let my beloved come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits."

His dramatic power was very great. He was profuse in his gestures; intensely animated, and in his vehement passages would stamp his foot, and his voice would ring out like a trumpet. His humor was not equal to his pathos. He could give a quaint and humorous expression, and tell a pleasant anecdote; but, after all, his strength lay in his intense feeling, which rose to a sublime passion, and in his subduing tenderness. Sometimes he would pause, overcome by his own appeal to sinners, and burst into tears. In his descriptive power he equaled, we firmly believe, any man who ever lived. Through his kindled imagination he could make pictures realities, and the hearers could see the judge put on his black cap as he was about to condemn the prisoner, and the wrecked ship sinking beneath the waves, and the blind beggar groping his way on the edge of an awful precipice. Chesterfield cried out with horror as he saw the beggar, "Heavens! he is gone!" and the sailors saw the wreck and cried, "Man the life-boat!"

Often he would weave into his sermon an anecdote. When he was a boy one of his companions said to him, "George, one day you may become a preacher." "If I do," was the reply, "I will not tell stories as old Cole does," alluding to a preacher of that day. But he soon found in the actual work of the ministry the value of a well-told anecdote. He was quick to see the value of any little incident which came under his observation, and would reproduce it with telling effect. His genius turned common things into gold, and turned gold into diamonds. When in Boston, Whitefield was told of a little boy who had heard him preach, and soon after was taken sick, and on his dying bed whispered feebly, "I am going to see Mr. Whitefield's God." He told the incident at the close of a powerful exhortation, and then, turning from the parents to the children, he said in tones which brought tears to nearly all eyes, "Little children, if your parents will not come to Christ, do you come and go to heaven without them."

His dramatic power, which was the gift of nature, was carefully cultivated, and his intense feeling and devotion to truth

saved him from running into affectation, which is the vice of many a trained speaker. It is said that he studied privately the rules of speaking, and that the delivery of a sermon would improve up to its fortieth repetition. Before his conversion he read a great deal of dramatic literature, of which he was very fond, and, like Charles Wesley, and other bright schoolboys of that day, took a prominent part in amateur dramatic performances. The knowledge which he thus gained was sanctified, and did good service in the holiest of callings.

Whitefield was often very happy in the choice of subjects for his sermons, and thus he arrested attention at the outset. He did not, however, like some of his imitators, choose eccentric subjects, such as Jehudi's penknife and Paul's cloak, and set the hearers wondering what he was going to make out, or marvel at his legerdemain in bringing flowers and fruit out of empty boxes. On board the ship which bore him to Georgia he preached, when but twenty-three years of age, to the officers and sailors on the sins of profanity and drunkenness. In the Newgate prison he told the prisoners of the "penitent thief." At Bath, where the people gathered to drink at the hot wells, he bade thirsty souls to "Come and drink of the waters of life freely," and at Alnwick, while the races were in progress, his text was, "So run that ye may obtain." But the best and boldest thing he did was to stand before the faculty and students of Harvard University, who had been influenced by what he believed to be the defective theology of Tillotson and Samuel Clark, and preach a frank and manly sermon from these words: "We are not as many, who corrupt the word of God." "God gave me," he says, "great freedom and boldness of speech."

Sometimes, but rarely, he preached on topics of the hour. He preached a thanksgiving sermon on the great victory at Rossbach, won by Frederick the Great over the French, a victory which stirred the blood of the German race from the Alps to the Baltic, and which, in its results, was one of the most important in modern times. He preached on the glorious victory won by Wolfe on the heights of Quebec, which broke forever the power of France in North America. But generally he kept closely to the great themes of the Gospel. His second sermon was from the text, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature;"

his third from the text, "Ye are justified;" and the fourth from the text, "Ye are glorified." From place to place he journeyed for thirty-four years, proclaiming the ruin of man, the love of God, salvation through Jesus, repentance, faith, heaven and hell; and he spoke earnestly, as a man should speak who believes these doctrines with every fiber of his being. He felt that men ought to hear these doctrines, for there was in them power to move the world, and he determined to make men hear them. In his exhortations he would in turn address different classes of hearers. At Charleston he spoke to those of different ages—to the old, the middle-aged, and the young; and then to the different races—to the whites, the Indians, and the negroes. Sometimes he would make an appeal to individuals. On one occasion it is related he saw a young man in a tree who had climbed up there to ridicule him. Whitefield bade the young man imitate Zaccheus, and come down and receive Jesus. The word was backed with power. He heard, came down, believed, and soon after went forth to preach the Gospel.

The courage which Whitefield displayed in his sermons was remarkable. By nature he was timid, and shrank from danger. He saw an assassin in a drunken rowdy who suddenly struck him. When about to speak to a rough crowd he trembled so that his wife pulled his gown to arrest his attention, and said, "George, play the man for your God." His courage was not physical, but that higher kind which endures—moral courage. When he was fairly roused he would hurl thunderbolts without fear of consequences. If he could have kept back the truth, he never acted as though he wanted to. At the close of life he might have said to those to whom he preached, "I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God." We have read many passages from his sermons which glow with indignation against sin, like the language of the old Hebrew prophets: "Woe unto you," he cried to the fashionable and wealthy sinners who were found at every service in Tottenham Court Chapel; "woe unto you, who, not content with sinning yourselves, turn factors for hell, and make a trade of tempting others to sin. Woe unto you, who sell your consciences and pawn your souls for a little worldly wealth or honor. Woe unto you, who climb up to high places in Church or State by corruption, bribery, extortion, cringing, flattery, or bowing

down to and soothing the vices of those by whom you expect to rise. Woe unto you! I tremble for you. How can you escape the damnation of hell?"

This may seem like coarse language to modern ears, but it struck the mark. Where sin is bold the preaching should be bolder still. Popular sermons of the present day are somewhat instructive, and the thoughts are clothed in graceful sentences, but we miss that tremendous earnestness which sweeps all before it like a flood; that peculiar energy which dares to say all that is in the mind and heart; that great boldness of speech which made Chatham and Whitefield rule their hearers with an almost unquestioned sway.

One element of Whitefield's popularity was his entire freedom from bigotry, and this fact opened many a door to him which was closed to others. In this respect he was in advance of his age. John Wesley, who knew him well, says of him: "He breathes nothing but peace and love. Bigotry cannot stand before him, but hides its head whenever he comes." This is high, but not unmerited, praise, as many passages in the sermons show. Preaching on one occasion, he exclaimed, "I ask men not what they are, so that they love Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth. Christianity will never flourish until we are all of one heart and one mind. This may be esteemed as enthusiasm and madness." His conduct gave proof that he believed what he preached. He was ever the friend of Dissenters and Quakers. He welcomed Doddridge to his pulpit, and Doddridge went and preached there, much to the horror of Isaac Watts. "What more particularly endears Bunyan to my heart," he says, "is this, he was of a catholic spirit. The want of water, adult baptism, with this man of God was no bar to outward Christian communion." Though he had personal and doctrinal differences with John and Charles Wesley, yet he was generous enough to provide a comfortable vault under his chapel where all three could be laid after death. He told his Church members of his plan. "We will lie together. You will not let them enter your chapel while they are alive. They can do you no harm when they are dead." Such a spirit, free from the slightest trace of bigotry, won him the hearts of those who fought bitterly against each other about Church government, and about "the solemn league and covenant."

Tyerman remarks, as, indeed, all the other writers do, that Whitefield's sermons are below his fame. There is nothing wonderful in this. The utterances of many great orators, when they are printed, do not justify the reputation of their authors. We miss the voice and the gesture and the feeling. Probably the best of Whitefield's sermons have not come down to us. Eighty-one of them have been printed. Of these eighteen were printed from shorthand notes without his revision, and were preached during the last seven years of his life, and forty-six of the remainder were given to the press before he was twenty-five years of age. It would be unjust to judge him by these. And yet in the sermons of his youth, and in the imperfect report of those of his later years, we see many passages of manly eloquence. The ideas are clearly brought out, the words are good Saxon, and the style is forcible. Here, for instance, is an extract from one of his youthful sermons, and we venture to say that if it were found in Milton's prose works it would receive high praise. It is better in a literary point of view than much which Milton wrote:—

> Lastly, often meditate on the joys of heaven. Think, think with what unspeakable glory those happy souls are now encircled, who when on earth were called to deny themselves, and were not disobedient to the call. Hark! methinks I hear them chanting their everlasting hallelujahs, and spending an eternal day in echoing triumphant songs of joy. And do you not long, my brethren, to join this heavenly choir? Do not your hearts burn within you? As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, do not your souls so long after the blessed company of these sons of God? Behold, then, a heavenly ladder reached down to you by which you may climb to this holy hill. If any man will come after them, let him deny himself and follow them. By this we, even we, may be lifted up into the same blissful regions, there to enjoy an eternal rest with the people of God, and join with them in singing doxologies and songs of praise to the everlasting, blessed, all glorious, most adorable Trinity for ever and ever.

It would be easy to quote similar passages in his sermons, which, with all their faults, are worth reading. His warnings to sinners to "flee from the wrath to come," are most impressive. Some of his illustrations are very beautiful, and modern preachers would do well to remember them. Once when he was preaching from the text, "Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires," he says:—

When I was some years ago at Shields, I went into a glass house and saw a workman take a piece of glass and put it into three furnaces in succession. I asked, "Why do you put it into so many fires?" He answered, "O sir, the first was not hot enough, nor the second, and therefore we put it into the third; that will make it transparent." O, thought I, does this man put this glass into one furnace after another, that it may be made perfect? Then, O my God, put me into one furnace after another, that my soul may be transparent!

One of the best sermons was the last which he preached, and has a startling comparison. "Works, works! a man get to heaven by works. I would as soon think of climbing to the moon on a rope of sand!" It also has one of those abrupt and happy transitions which show, we hardly know which, the instinct or the art of a great orator: "I go to rest prepared; my sun has arisen, and by aid from heaven has given light to many. It is now about to set for—no! it is about to rise to the zenith of immortal glory."

There are many quaint expressions in both his sermons and letters, which come partly from reading his favorite work, Matthew Henry's Commentary. That famous commentary, it may be said in passing, is a work not so much of learning as of power. Robert Hall, like Whitefield, used to study it daily, and we cannot read a page of it without being well rewarded. Though John Wesley did not fancy Henry's quaint sayings, and purposely refrained from putting them into his "Notes," yet they will always charm the average reader. Whitefield reflected Henry's style when he used such expressions as "Paul could stand a whipping but not a weeping farewell," and, (speaking of baptismal controversies,) "It is a strange thing how bigots can set the world on fire by throwing water at each other."

Tyerman thinks (i, 98) that it was imprudent in Whitefield to attack in his sermons the class of godless ministers which was then in the Church. He admits that there were "ample grounds" for such an attack, but it resulted in no good; it was not politic, and exposed the preacher to retaliatory criticisms. From this opinion we differ. Whitefield was just the man to sharply rebuke those worthless clergymen who cared little for their flocks—except for their fleece—and ran, somewhat disguised, to the horse-races, the dancing halls, the card rooms, the taverns, and the theaters. In New England the "half-way

covenant" brought in a host of unconverted ministers. Whitefield did good when he rebuked these false prophets, and the Church feels the effect of his labors to day. The leading man in New England was Governor Belcher, and he earnestly exhorted the great preacher to "go on in stirring up the ministers, for," said he, "judgment must begin at the house of God." And in his righteous denunication he was sustained by the most spiritually minded preachers, both in Great Britain and in America.

The industry and the power of endurance which he showed for many years was marvelous. In one place he preached nine times, and expounded nearly eighteen times in a single week. In four days in midwinter he preached twelve sermons in the open air, and three in the chapels. At Alnwick he preached three sermons a day during the week of the races. His preaching was constant, and was not interrupted by a month's vacation every year, spent among the mountains or by the sea-shore. As a result he was, according to John Wesley, an old man before his time, and he had to put himself on what he called "short allowance," that is, he had to deny himself, and preach only once a day, except on Sunday, when he preached thrice! Well might such a man write, "I scarce know what it is to have an idle moment."

That which sustained him was the fact that his work was his delight. He rejoiced in the act of preaching to the thousands which gathered in the open fields, as the sailor rejoices when the gale blows, or the soldier when he plunges into the smoke of battle. The love of preaching rose to a sublime passion. It is pleasant to notice the exultant spirit of the man, as it found expression in his numerous letters. "Field preaching is my place," he writes; "In this I am carried on eagle's wings." "I am never better than when I am on the full stretch for God." "I want a thousand tongues to praise him." "Mounts are the best pulpits and the heavens the best sounding boards. O for a power to equal my will! I would fly from pole to pole, publishing the everlasting Gospel of the Son of God." He asserts that he does not repent of being "a poor, despised, cast out, and now almost worn out itinerant." It makes him very happy to be "ranging and hunting in the American woods after poor sinners." He declared that he thought every day

lost that was not spent in field preaching, and exclaims, "O that death may find me either praying or preaching!" He rose from the sick-bed, and stood in the pulpit as pale as death, and preached to the people with earnestness and power. A man with such a spirit was sure to make his influence deeply felt. To such a one the glowing exhortation which Howell Harris gave was needless, "Go on and blaze abroad the fame of Jesus till you take your flight to bow with the innumerable company before his unutterable glory."

We had intended to say something of Whitefield's work in founding, and in sustaining while he lived, the Orphan House in Georgia; and also of his controversies with Wesley. But these are not matters of abiding interest, and our space is limited. The orphanage was burned and was not rebuilt, and the controversy with Wesley is not now of the slightest importance. Neither does the present generation care about the war of the pamphlets which Whitefield unwillingly gave rise to, and which Tyerman records with much minuteness. Some of these pamphlets are eulogistic, some of them are critical, and many of them are grossly abusive; but all of them put together have not the slightest effect in determining Whitefield's place in history. Posterity has given its verdict about the man, and from that verdict there is no appeal.

His last sermon was preached in the open fields at Exeter, New Hampshire, before a great multitude. He arose wearily; his voice was hoarse, and he seemed to be exhausted. But soon his voice rang out as of old; he spoke with unusual earnestness, and held the people spell-bound by his oratory. He then left for Newburyport, where he was to preach on the following day. While at supper the people flocked in front of the house to hear a few words from him. "Brother," he said to one who was near by, "you must speak to the people. I cannot say a word." He took a candle and hastened to his room, but before he reached it the "ruling spirit, strong in death," made him pause, and, turning to the crowd, he gave his last exhortation. He spoke with tenderness, and he kept on speaking "until the candle which he held in his hand burned away, and went out in its socket." That candle was a type of his own life, which consumed itself in giving light. The same night he died. He had more than once expressed a wish to die suddenly, and that

wish was realized. His work and his life ended together, and no doubt "sudden death" was to him "sudden glory."

The news of his death awoke grief in England and in America, and many tributes were paid to his memory. John Wesley, who had known him for thirty-seven years, preached a memorial sermon to an "immense multitude" in Tottenham Court Road Chapel; and Cowper, in his poem on "Hope," described him as a man of blameless life and of flaming zeal. Weeping thousands followed the remains from the house where he died to the church where they were deposited.

In the year 1749, when Whitefield was but thirty-four years of age, William Pulteney, Earl of Bath, a statesman of great ability, prophesied thus in a letter to the Countess of Huntingdon: "Mocked and reviled as Mr. Whitefield is by all ranks of society, still I contend that the day will come when England will be just, and own his greatness as a reformer and his goodness as a minister of the most high God." That day has come, and we hope the day will also come when England will pay to the memory of the greatest of modern evangelists a fitting tribute—a memorial tablet in Westminster Abbey.

---

## Art. VIII.—"ATONEMENT" OF THE EARLY CHURCH NO PRICE PAID TO SATAN.

Instances have not been wanting in recent times of the *unqualified* declaration, that the Church for the first thousand years of its history taught that the redemptive price was paid to the devil. The worth or worthlessness of such a statement may best be judged by viewing it in the light of its several implications. Taking theological language in the sense which usage has given it, the following may fairly be classed under the implications of the statement in question: 1. The entire Church, in the thousand years preceding the teaching of Anselm, allowed a positive right in the devil over fallen men. 2. It conceived of a contract based on this right—a proposed exchange between God and the devil. 3. It taught that the devil gained in the transaction something which he coveted. 4. It considered this transaction with the devil, this paying to

him of a ransom, a pre-eminent factor in the saving office of Christ.

It is a very serious breach in the above statement that not one of the things which it implies is so much as intimated by any Church teacher till near the end of the second century, if even at that date. Baur, who has gone as far as any historian of rank in crediting the early Church with the theory of a ransom paid to the devil, discovers no trace of such a theory till he comes to the writings of Irenæus, composed near the close of the second century. He thinks, indeed, that the Gnostic representations of a dealing between the Supreme Being and the Demiurge prefigured and prepared for the theory, but still makes no pretense of finding even an obscure expression of the theory itself prior to Irenæus. An examination of the writings of the early Church will show that Baur has not overlooked any materials that might be to his purpose. Abundant references to the sufferings and death of Christ appear, and his saving office is magnified from a variety of stand-points. The idea that he is the one and the perfect Mediator is clearly set forth. Says Clement of Rome: "Jesus Christ is the high-priest of all our offerings, the defender and helper of our infirmity. By him we look up to the heights of heaven; by him we behold, as in a glass, his immaculate and most excellent visage; by him are the eyes of our hearts opened; by him our foolish and darkened understanding blossoms up anew toward his marvelous light; by him the Lord has willed that we should taste of immortal knowledge."—Epistle i, chap. xxxvi. Ignatius gives an equally vivid expression to the same sentiment, speaking of Christ as the "high-priest to whom the holy of holies has been committed, and who alone has been intrusted with the secrets of God;" as "the door of the Father, by which Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets, and the apostles, and the Church, enter."—*Philadel.*, chap. ix. Again, the early fathers give abundant expression to the idea of vicarious sacrifice. "Let us look," says Clement of Rome, "steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious to God is that blood, which, having been shed for our salvation, has set the grace of repentance before the whole world."—Epistle i, chap. vii. "On account of the love he bore us, Jesus Christ gave his blood for us by

the will of God; his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our souls."—Chap. xlix. The same teaching finds a beautiful expression in the Epistle to Diognetus: "He himself took on him the burden of our iniquities; he gave his own Son a ransom for us; the holy One for transgressors; the blameless One for the wicked; the righteous for the unrighteous; the incorruptible for the corruptible; the immortal for the mortal. For what could cover our sins save his righteousness? By whom could we, the wicked and ungodly, be justified, save by the only Son of God? O sweet exchange! O unsearchable operation! O benefits surpassing all expectation! that the wickedness of many should be hid by a single righteous One, and that the righteousness of one should justify many transgressors!"—Chap. ix. The positive introduction of a new life into the human sphere was another of the cardinal features of Christ's work as emphasized by the early Church. Says Ignatius: "Wickedness disappeared, ignorance was removed, and the old kingdom abolished, God himself being manifested in human form to bring in a new eternal life."—*Eph.*, chap. xix. "I desire the drink of God, namely, his blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life."—*Rom.*, chap. vii. Justin Martyr, (about the middle of the second century,) and those that followed him, frequently viewed the work of Christ with reference to its effect upon the demon world, or the dominion of Satan—a point on which earlier writers appear comparatively silent. He speaks of the demons as trembling at the power of Christ's name, as "subdued to his name and the dispensation of his suffering."—*Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. xxx. He represents the advent of Christ as revealing to Satan for the first time his everlasting doom, and so stirring him up to begin his blasphemy against God. (*Fragment in Irenæus.*) "Christ, the Son of God," says he, "submitted to become incarnate in order that by this dispensation the serpent that sinned in the beginning, and the angels like him, may be destroyed, and that death may be contemned."—*Trypho*, chap. xlv. As these passages indicate, the only relation which Justin Martyr affirms on the part of Christ's work to the dominion of Satan is one of limitation and destruction. He nowhere intimates that a redemptive price was due to Satan, or was paid to him. This theological phantom belongs to a later age.

Unless Irenæus was an exception, the fathers of the first two centuries gave no place to it among the rich gems of their soteriology.

This brings us to the case of Irenæus. Did he teach that the redemptive price was paid to the devil? Among all his extant writings there are only two passages which in any degree justify the imputation of such a theory to him. The first of these is as follows: "We have received, according to the ministrations of the Word, who is perfect in all things as the mighty Word, and very man, who, redeeming us by his own blood in a manner consonant to reason, gave himself as a redemption for those who had been led into captivity. And since the apostasy tyrannized over us unjustly, and, though we were by nature the property of the omnipotent God, alienated us contrary to nature, rendering us its own disciples, the Word of God, powerful in all things, and not defective with regard to his own justice, did turn righteously even against that apostasy, and redeem from it his own property; not by violent means, as the [apostasy] had obtained dominion over us at the beginning, when it insatiably snatched away what was not its own, but by means of persuasion, as became a God of counsel, who does not use violent means to obtain what he desires; so that neither should justice be infringed upon, nor the ancient handiwork of God go to destruction."—*Heresies*, book v, chap. i, sec. 1. The second passage occurs but a page or two after the first. "The advent, therefore, of him whom these men represent as coming to the things of others was not righteous, nor did he truly redeem us by his own blood, if he did not really become man, restoring to his own handiwork what was said [of it] in the beginning, that man was made after the image and likeness of God; not snatching away by stratagem the property of another, but taking possession of his own in a righteous and gracious manner. As far as concerned the apostasy, indeed, he redeems us righteously from it by his own blood; but as regards us who have been redeemed, graciously. For we have given nothing to him previously, nor does he desire anything from us, as if he stood in need of it; but we do stand in need of fellowship with him."

To one having the theory already in mind the above passages, viewed by themselves, might seem to countenance the

conclusion that Irenæus taught that the redemptive price was paid to the apostasy, that is, to the devil. Such a conclusion, however, is contradicted, not by some sentence of an isolated work written at a different time in the author's life, and perchance from a different stand-point, but by the whole context—one might say by the whole argument—of the very book in which the passages quoted occur. Two phrases need to be considered. Irenæus says that God redeemed his property from the apostasy not by violent means, but by *persuasion*. Upon whom was this persuasion exercised? Certainly not upon the devil, but upon man. This interpretation suits perfectly the antithesis which Irenæus endeavors to set forth. While the devil, with infamous greed and treachery, snatched away man, who did not belong to him, God recovers his own, brings back man to himself by means perfectly fair and open. Through the incarnate Word he powerfully addresses the reason, conscience, and higher interests of man. Thus, without the use of any questionable expedient, he *persuades man* to escape the bonds of Satan by persuading him to leave his sins; these bonds, as Irenæus explicitly states, being identical with "transgression and apostasy."—Chap. v, 21, 3. His idea may be counted the same as the following in the epistle to Diognetus: "As a Saviour he sent him, and as seeking to persuade, not to compel us; for violence has no place in the character of God."—Chap. vii. If Irenæus would have it appear that God respected the claim of Satan, and would *persuade* him to relinquish it by the offer of a recompense, why does he go on to speak of Christ as the stronger than the strong man, who, binding the latter, takes from him those unjustly held in captivity? (Chap. v, 21, 3.) Why does he represent Christ as "waging war against our enemy, and crushing him who had at the beginning led us away captives in Adam, and trampling on his head?"—Chap. v, 21, 1. Unless we assume that Irenæus was exceedingly ambitious to contradict himself, and that within a small compass, it is preposterous to affirm that he understood the divine persuasion to have been exercised upon the devil.

The other expression claiming attention is the statement that the incarnate God, so far as concerned the apostasy, redeemed us righteously from it by his own blood; so far as concerns us

he redeemed graciously. This language may *suggest* the conclusion that the redemptive price was regarded as paid to Satan, but it by no means *necessitates* such a conclusion. New Testament usage abundantly illustrates that to redeem from a thing does not necessarily imply the payment to that thing of a price; it may signify simply rescue or deliverance therefrom. It would do no violence to the language of Irenæus, as we think, were it paraphrased on this wise: Over against the devil God showed himself as supremely righteous, over against man as supremely gracious. He showed himself supremely righteous in that he accomplished man's redemption by moral means and especially by self-sacrifice; in that he did not requite stratagem with stratagem, usurpation with usurpation, but took back his own in a way fully accordant with the free agency of his creatures. Even the extreme provocation of the usurper did not drive him into any violent proceeding. Through a human nature assumed and made obedient even unto the death of the cross, he presented the most perfect and rational offset to the dominion of the devil, or, what in the view of Irenæus was the same thing, the dominion of sin over man. In the whole mode and manner of the deliverance God showed forth his righteousness so signally, that even the devil could not impeach it, in the deliverance itself, his grace toward men. It may be fairly inferred that Irenæus meant no more than did John of Damascus by the following: "His goodness shines forth in this, that he did not despise the weakness of his creature, but pitied the fate of the fallen, and extended to him his hand: his justice in this, that, man being conquered, he did not rescue him from the tyrant through another, nor by force snatch him from death, but him whom death, on account of sin, had sentenced to his servitude, the good and just made a victor again, and, what seemed beyond the power of any art, he restored the like by the like," [that is, human nature by human nature.]—*De Fide Orth.*, chap. iii, 1. But John of Damascus distinctly repudiated the doctrine that the redemptive price was paid to the devil. That Irenæus did not think of Christ's blood being given to the devil as a ransom is clearly intimated by the fact that he nowhere allows a right in the devil over fallen men, but uniformly represents his dominion as a usurped and iniquitous dominion. A second fact in the direction of the same con-

clusion is the statement that God did not, like the devil, resort to stratagem; for if he had engaged to give a redemptive price to the devil, which was no real gain to the latter, but simply a means of overthrow, it would have been a supreme instance of stratagem. So manifest was this to the fathers themselves that those who went furthest in acknowledging the payment of a ransom to Satan went furthest, also, in confessing herein a divine stratagem. The redemptive price reposed on their theory to remain a redemptive price, and turned into a bait to decoy Satan to his defeat. A third fact of similar import is the representation of Irenæus that the advent and sayings of Christ revealed to the devil for the first time his everlasting doom. (Chap. v, 26, 2.) How should the same God who came with this revelation be thought as coming with the offer of a treaty to the son of perdition?

Again, Irenæus uses language which indicates that the blood or offered life of Christ was understood to be not a ransom from the claim of the devil, but a means of positive commendation to God. What other sense can be attributed to the following? "And not by the aforesaid things alone has the Lord manifested himself, but also by means of his passion. For doing away with that disobedience of man which had taken place at the beginning by the occasion of a tree, 'He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;' rectifying that disobedience which had occurred by reason of a tree, through that obedience which was upon the tree."—Chapter v, 16, 3. Still further, the way in which Irenæus sets forth his more specific explanation of how men are freed from the bonds of the devil indicates strongly that he thought of a ransom from him only in the sense of rescue or recovery. After emphasizing the idea that in all fitness man must be recovered through man, the vanquished and sinful human nature through a victorious and righteous human nature, he thus describes the dissolution of the devil's dominion: "The Word of God, the Maker of all things, conquering him by means of a human nature, and, showing him to be an apostate, has put him under the power of man. For he says: 'Behold, I confer upon you the power of treading upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the power of the enemy,' in order that, as he obtained dominion over man by apostasy, so again his apostasy might be de-

prived of power by means of man turning back again to God." —Chapter v, 24, 4. Here evidently the power of the devil over men is represented as overthrown, not by the canceling of any claim of his through a ransom, but through men being attracted to the person and the righteousness of the incarnate Word. It is finally an evidence worth mentioning, that neither Tertullian, a contemporary in the West, nor Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenæus, give any countenance in their writings to the idea that the redemptive price was paid to Satan. A preponderance of evidence compels us to agree with Duncker, Hagenbach, Gieseler, Dorner, and Kahnis in the verdict that the charge of teaching the obnoxious tenet is not proved against this noble theologian of the early Church.

Irenæus gives us quite a symmetrical and finished view of Christ's saving office, without the assistance of any such ingredient. As he represents, Christ's obedience offsets man's disobedience, and so makes man fitly an object of divine grace. Christ, as the second Adam, *recapitulates* the race in himself, provides for it a new center and head, sanctifies human nature in his own person, redeems it from death, sets up, so to speak, the standard of a renewed humanity, and imparts new life to all who in faith submit to him. It may not be certain that Irenæus regarded the vicarious office of Christ as necessary in the sense of being *absolutely* required by the divine *nature* as a condition of the forgiveness of sins; but he at least regarded it as relatively necessary, the means of recovering man supremely suited to the divine administration. He resembles Anselm in his emphasis upon the truth that a God-man alone is properly qualified to fulfill the office of a redeemer, but differs from him in making the introduction of man to divine association, and the imparting to him of a divine life, quite as prominent features in the work of the God-man as satisfaction to justice. "It was for this end," says he, "that the Word of God was made man, and he who was the Son of God became the Son of man, that man, having been taken into the Word, and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God; for by no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality, unless first incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we also are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility, and the mortal by

immortality, that we might receive the adoption of sons."—Ch. iii, 19, 1.

As Baur allows that Origen was the first to give a wider development to the theory which he attributes to Irenæus, (*Dogmengeschichte*, i, 642,) we may next proceed to consider the teachings of the Alexandrian genius. What ought we to expect from this mystical, original, and bold speculator? Shall we not find in him, on the subject of redemption, more fertility than consistency and sobriety of thought? Will not his excessive eclecticism, manifested in other connections, incline him here to go beyond the bounds of Christian ideas, and to admit some foreign elements—elements bearing more or less of a Gnostic and heathen tinge? Such is evidently the case. Origen is far from exhibiting the simplicity and consistency which characterize Irenæus' exposition of Christ's work. It is a party-colored picture which he gives. Views noble and crude are intermingled. We find with him a class of expressions nowhere to be discovered in the writings of any previous Church teacher. He makes distinct mention of a right in the devil over fallen men, of a contract based upon that right, and of the payment of a redemptive price to the adversary. The following passages are, perhaps, the most explicit upon these points that can be quoted from the writings of Origen: "We have been redeemed by the precious blood of the Only-begotten. If, therefore, we have been purchased by a price, we have, without doubt, been purchased from another whose servants we were, who also proposed the price which he wished as a condition of releasing from his power those whom he was holding. But the devil, to whom we had been drawn by our sins, was holding us. Therefore he proposed, as the price of our redemption, the blood of Christ, which alone was so precious as to suffice for all."—*Comm. in Rom.*, ii, 13. "To whom did he give his soul as a redemptive price for many? Not, indeed, to God. Was it, then, to the evil one? He truly had us in his power till the soul of Jesus was given as a redemptive price to him, deceived with the idea that he could possess it, nor reflecting that he could not endure the pains involved in retaining it. Wherefore, death, which appeared to have subjected him to its own dominion, now rules him no more, since he was made free among the dead, and was

stronger than the power of death, and in such sense stronger that whosoever of those whom death had conquered wished to follow him were able to do so, death possessing no more power against them; for whosoever is with Jesus cannot be assailed with death. . . . The soul of the Son of God was given as a redemptive price for us, but not his spirit, for he delivered that to the Father, saying, 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit;' nor, indeed, his body, for there is no intimation of this in Scripture. And, since he gave his soul as a redemptive price for many, but it did not remain with him to whom it had been given, he says in the fifteenth Psalm, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.'"—*In Matt.*, tom. xvi, 8. We have in the above an abundant illustration of a point already noted. The acknowledgment of a right in Satan, and the payment to him of a redemptive price, turn out to be a mere sham. He makes no new acquisition, and loses the dominion already possessed. In the contract formed divine Wisdom took advantage of his blindness, and over-reached him entirely. It is also an incongruity that Origen in one place uses language which militates against the idea of any contract existing. He says that while God delivered up the Son out of compassion toward the race, and Judas delivered him up out of avarice, Satan delivered him up "from fear, lest the human race, through his instruction, should be taken from his grasp."—*Comm. in Matt. Series*, § 75. Here there is no mention of any stipulations, no indication that the adversary thought of conceding any thing in return for the death of Christ. He delivers him to crucifixion to protect the dominion over men already possessed. So little of any thing like a real exchange appears according to the total representation of Origen, that Gieseler concludes that he did not have such in mind. "Origen does not consider," says he, "that Christ, in the proper sense, gave his soul as a ransom to the devil, but only in a figurative and qualified sense."—*Blos Bildlich und Uneigentlich.* This is a charitable conclusion, and it is only to be hoped that it is not over-charitable.

This mystic transaction with the devil by no means completed the circle of Origen's contemplation of the saving office of Christ. It may not be a superior, but it is a different view which Origen brings forward, when, borrowing the heathen idea of magic, he discerns a kind of divine magic in the death

of Christ. "Did not," says he, "the disciples of Jesus see, when they ventured to prove that he who was crucified yesterday, or the day before, underwent this death voluntarily in behalf of the human race, that this was analogous to the case of those who have died for their country in order to remove pestilence, or barrenness, or tempests? For it is probable that there is in the nature of things, for certain mysterious reasons which are difficult to be understood by the multitude, such a virtue, that one just man dying a voluntary death for the common good might be the means of removing wicked spirits which are the cause of plagues, or barrenness, or tempests, or similar calamities."—*Against Celsus*, i, 31. "When the souls of those who die for the Christian faith depart from the body with great glory, they destroy the power of the demons, and frustrate their designs against men."—*Against Celsus*, viii, 44. But views reaching into a much higher range are found with Origen. The office of Christ in conjoining the human and the divine, and in dispensing thereby a new life to men, is not overlooked. "That," says he, "which is predicted by the prophets is worthy of God: that he who is the brightness and express image of the divine nature should come into the world with the holy human soul which was to animate the body of Jesus, to sow the seed of his word, which might bring all who received and cherished it into union with the Most High God."—*Against Celsus*, vii, 17. "From him there began the union of the divine with the human nature, in order that the human, by communion with the divine, might rise to be divine, not in Jesus alone, but in all those who not only believe but enter upon the life which Jesus taught, and which elevates to friendship with God and communion with him every one who lives according to the precepts of Jesus."—iii, 28 The view, however, which occurs with special frequency in the writings of Origen is that Christ in his passion presented a holy sacrifice to God. If he saw in the death of Christ a Satanward aspect, he saw no less a Godward aspect, and he certainly emphasized the latter as much as the former. Speaking of the typical import of the priest's act in placing his hand upon the head of the victim, he says that he placed the sins of the human race on his head. "For he himself is the head of the body, his Church."—*Hom. in Lev.*, i, 3. The sacrifices,

generally, of the Mosaic dispensation are represented as looking forward to the incarnate Son. "Almost every victim that is offered has somewhat of the form and image of Christ. For in him every victim is recapitulated, insomuch that all victims have ceased which preceded him in type and shadow."—*Hom. in Lev.*, iii, 5. It is distinctly stated that the sacrifice was unto God. "He who was made in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man, presented to God for the sin which he had received from us (for he bore our sins) an immaculate victim, that is, his spotless flesh."—*Hom. in Lev.*, iii, 1. This offering, moreover, had in some sense a propitiating effect upon God. "Through the offering of his own body he made God propitious to men."—*Comm. in Rom.*, iii, 8. While every death for righteousness' sake is conceived as having a certain power to cover sins, it is maintained that the death of Christ alone has power to cover the sins of the world. "Purer than all the living, this man dies for the people, bearing our sins and infirmities, for he was able to blot out all the sins of the whole world received into himself, since he did no sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth."—*In John, tom.* xxviii, 14. The benefit of Christ's sacrifice is pictured as extending not only to men, but to all rational beings. "Not only for the earthly, but also for the heavenly, was the victim Jesus offered.—*Hom. in Lev.*, i, 3. Thus it appears that the payment of a redemptive price to Satan was only one factor in Origen's view of Christ's saving office; a factor, too, made no more prominent than the strongly contrasted idea of a sacrifice to God.

Gregory of Nyssa, who wrote in the last half of the fourth century, was the most Origenistic of all the distinguished admirers of Origen. Very naturally, therefore, we find in him a reproduction of Origen's theory of a dealing with the devil. In one point he goes beyond Origen, representing the incarnation itself as a means of decoying the adversary to the desired transaction. His exposition of the subject is no less peculiar and fanciful than that of his ingenious predecessor. "Those," says he, "who have sold their liberty for money, becoming the slaves of the purchasers, as having sold their own selves, and it is permitted neither to them, nor to another for them, to proclaim their liberty; and if any one in his regard for the

person sold uses force against the purchaser, he will appear unjust, as wresting away by violence that which was legally acquired; but if any one is willing to redeem the slave, there is no law which forbids. In like manner, when we by our own will had sold ourselves, it was fitting that he who was about to restore us to liberty should think of no tyrannical, but of a just, mode of recovery. But the just mode is to give whatever ransom the possessor desires. What, therefore, is it probable that he who has the rule will prefer? For what will he who through envy closed his eyes to the good, and became filled with the lust of dominion, exchange him who is in his possession, except for the highest price, receiving more for the less, so that he may feed his passion of pride? But he was aware that the traditions and records of preceding ages gave account of nothing comparable with that which he saw in him who now appeared. [Here Gregory enumerates the wonders of Christ's ministry.] The enemy, therefore, perceiving this power in him, sees that gain is to be made by an exchange. Therefore he desires greatly that he should become the ransom of those shut up in the prison of death. But, as being unable to behold the naked face of God, he could not have looked upon him unless he had discerned in him a portion of flesh like unto that which through sins he held in chains. Therefore the divinity was veiled, so that directing his attention to that which was familiar to him, he might not be terrified by the approach of his exalted might, and regarding the power which through miracles shone gradually brighter and brighter, might reckon [the possession of him] more to be desired than feared. . . . . That our ransom might be taken by him who sought it, the divinity was hid by the veil of our nature, in order that with the bait of the flesh there might be lowered the hook of the divinity."—*Oratio Catech.*, xxii–xxiv. The deceit herein practiced Gregory of Nyssa attempted to palliate by the assurance that God designed it, among other ends, for the good of Satan himself, just as a physician who secretly mixes medicine with food may design it for the good of the patient—a mode of arguing not altogether inapt on the part of Gregory, who taught the recoverability of Satan.

Like others who held similar views, Gregory of Nyssa by no means confined his conceptions of Christ's raising office to the

narrow bounds of the above theory. Not to mention other features, he held the view, largely cherished by the Greek fathers, of a mystical life-power disseminated by Christ through humanity in virtue of his participation in human nature. "As the principle of death," says he, "proceeding from one, pervaded the entire human nature, so in like manner the principle of the resurrection has extended itself through One upon mankind. (Chap. xvi.)

Whatever acceptance Gregory of Nyssa's view about a transaction with the devil may have found, it cannot be regarded as properly representative of the theology of the Greek Church, either in his own or in any following century. We find no intimation that such a theory was taught by Eusebius of Cæsarea; and if Cyril of Jerusalem had any fellowship with it, (*Gieseler, Dog.*, 381,) it would seem to have received no prominent place at his hands. Eusebius enumerates the following causes for the death of Christ: "First, as by the Word himself, that he might rule among the dead as among the living; second, that He who was sacrificed for us and was made a curse for us might wash away the stains of our sins; third, that, as a victim of God and a great sacrifice, he might make an offering to the Most High for the sins of the whole world; fourth, that he might check the lying and demoniac power; fifth, that through his friends and disciples the hope of the future life might be proclaimed to all."—*Dem. Eve.*, iv, 12. Eusebius like Justin Martyr attributed to Christ's ministry and death a limiting power upon the agency of demons; but this, of course, implies nothing as to the payment of a ransom to the devil. Similar expressions may be found in the New Testament. (Col. ii, 15; Heb. ii, 14.) That Christ's death was a sacrifice to God he states explicitly in other passages as well as in the above. "It became the Lamb of God," says he, "to render to God a sacrifice for the whole human race, 'For since through man came death, through man also the resurrection from the dead.'"—Chap. x, 1. Says Cyril of Jerusalem: "We were enemies of God through sin, and God had declared that the sinner must die. One of two things, therefore, was necessary: either God, remaining constant, must destroy all; or, using clemency, must let go the determination which he had expressed. But behold the wisdom of God! He preserves

both the steadfastness of his purpose and efficacious working of his goodness. Christ bore our sins in his own body on the tree, so that we, through his death, dead to sins, might be made alive to righteousness."—*Catech.*, xiii, 33. Upon these two authors of the fourth century Baur makes this comment: "Cyril of Jerusalem emphasizes especially the fact that Christ took upon himself the punishment of sin in his own body, and as the one dying for us was of no little worth, since he was no mere man, but the incarnate God, and his righteousness was far greater than the unrighteousness of men. Also Eusebius of Cæsarea finds the significance of the death of Jesus, particularly therein, that he was punished for us, and took upon himself the sufferings which not he, but we alone, because of the multitude of our sins, ought to bear."— *Versöhungslehere*, p. 99.

We discover, also, no intimation that Athanasius taught the Origenistic theory of the payment of a ransom to the devil. He views the death of Christ from a very different stand-point. A God of truth, as he argues, must keep his word in respect to the death penalty against disobedience. At the same time, it is unfitting that God should allow rational beings, partakers of his own word, to go to destruction. What, then, shall be done? Repentance alone will not suffice, for if only this condition were imposed God's truthfulness would be invaded, and, besides, repentance can only restrain from future sins; it cannot remove the seeds of death, or the corruption of nature induced by previous transgressions. In the Word of God alone can the proper resource be found. Since, now, the Word saw that man's case could not be remedied save through death, and, "Because it was not possible that the Word, the immortal One, and the Son of God, should die, he assumed a body which was able to die, that, being made a partaker of the Word, it might suffice death for all, and on account of the Word dwelling within it might remain incorrupt, and that finally corruption, through the grace of the resurrection, might depart from all. Hence, by offering to death, as a sacrifice and victim free from every stain, the body which he took, he warded off death from all of a similar nature, his own being offered for the rest."—*De Incar.*, chap. vi–ix.

With Gregory of Nazianzen, (a contemporary of Gregory of Nyssa,) we find an emphatic repudiation of the theory that

a ransom was paid to the devil. "To whom," he asks, "was the blood, the costly and glorious blood of God, who was at the same time High-priest and sacrifice, rendered? We were in the power of the evil one, since we were sold under sin. If now the ransom was given to none other than the one holding dominion, I ask to whom was this presented, and on what account? Was it given to the enemy himself? Shame on the reckless thought! Then had the robber received not merely from God, but God himself, a countless reward for his tyranny." —*Ullmann, Greg. V. Naz.*, p. 318. Gregory, to be sure, found some difficulty in the idea that the ransom was paid to God; he did not see that the divine nature required such a payment; but he rejected with abhorrence the claim of Satan, and concluded that God received the ransom, inasmuch as the incarnation and death of Christ formed a part of a practical scheme of salvation.

"John of Damascus," says Baur, "repudiated with the same abhorrence as Gregory [of Nazianzen] the representation that the blood of the Lord was offered to the tyrant."—*Versöhn.*, p. 91. Moreover, he had no scruples about representing Christ's death as an offering to God, if we are to judge from the following: "He dies, receiving death for the sake of our salvation, offering himself as a sacrifice to the Father in our behalf. For against him had we sinned, and to him was to be paid the price of our redemption, that by means of this compact we might be freed from condemnation. For, far be it that the blood of the Lord should have been offered to the tyrant."—*De Fide Orth.*, chap. iii, 27.

As John of Damascus, who wrote in the eighth century, was an authority of note, and was largely instrumental in giving the final stamp to the theology of the Greek Church, his view is to be counted eminently representative of the Greek Church in his own and in the following centuries. It would appear, therefore, that it was only a partial and transient reception which the doctrine of Satan's claim received in the Greek Church. Its theology was fully dominated by this doctrine in no single century, and, taking the first thousand years together, the exceptions certainly outweigh the examples. Says Kahnis, referring to the theory of Gregory of Nyssa: "However, the teaching concerning the payment of a ransom to the devil found little acceptance in the East."—*Dogmatik*, ii, p. 241.

We return now to the Latin Church. Between Irenæus and Anselm the three most eminent and authoritative dogmatic theologians in the West were, undoubtedly, Augustine, (died 430,) Leo the Great, (461,) and Gregory the Great, (604.) Their views, therefore, represent quite a broad space in the history of doctrine in the Western Church. As respects Augustine, we find him acknowledging a certain right in Satan over fallen men. But he affirms no contract with the devil based upon that right—no exchange, either proposed or accomplished, in accordance with the terms of a contract. Satan lost his right over men by proceeding against the sinless Son of Man as though he were guilty. By exacting from the innocent Christ the suffering and death which were not due he forfeited all right to that which had been due from mankind. All that God gave to Satan was the opportunity to exercise his malice for a little season upon himself. And this was not unbecoming; for, inasmuch as Satan fell through pride, and through pride man was enticed into his power, nothing could be more fitting than that God should overthrow his dominion by his humility, putting proud and violent usurpation to shame by conquering it through meekness and suffering. "By the justice of God, in some sense," says Augustine, "the human race was delivered into the power of the devil. . . . But the way in which man was thus delivered into the power of the devil ought not to be so understood as if God did this, or commanded it to be done, but that he only permitted it, yet that justly. For when he abandoned the sinner the author of the sin immediately entered. Yet God did not certainly so abandon his own creature as not to show himself to him as God creating and quickening, and, among penal evils, bestowing also many good things upon the evil. For he hath not in anger shut up his tender mercies. Nor did he dismiss man from the law of his own power when he permitted him to be in the power of the devil, since even the devil himself is not estranged from the power of the Omnipotent. . . . If, therefore, the commission of sins through the just anger of God subjected man to the devil, doubtless the remission of sins through the merciful reconciliation of God rescues man from the devil. But the devil was to be overcome, not by the might of God, but by his righteousness. . . . For what is more mighty than

the Omnipotent? But since the devil, by the fault perversity, was made a lover of might and a forsaker and assailant of righteousness, . . . it pleased God that, in order to the rescuing of man from the power of the devil, the devil should be conquered, not by might, but by righteousness; and that so also men, imitating Christ, should seek to conquer the devil by righteousness, not by might. Not that might is to be shunned as though it were something evil; but the order must be preserved whereby righteousness is before it.... What, then, is the righteousness by which the devil is conquered? What, except the righteousness of Jesus Christ? And how was he conquered? Because when he found in him nothing worthy of death, yet he slew him. And certainly it is just that we, whom he held as debtors, should be dismissed free by believing in him whom he slew without any debt. In this way it is that we are said to be justified by the blood of Christ.... He conquered the devil first by righteousness, and afterward by might: namely, by righteousness because he had no sin, and was slain by him most unjustly; but by might because, having been dead, he lived again, never afterward to die." *On the Trinity*, xiii, chap. xii–xiv.

A man of comprehensive thought like Augustine did not, of course, limit his conceptions of Christ's saving office to the above theory. He gives clear evidence of his persuasion that the death of Christ, beyond the mere canceling of the claim of Satan, was a means of reconciliation with God, a sacrifice to God in behalf of men. Such, beyond question, is the force of the following: "The whole redeemed city, that is to say, the congregation and community of the saints, is offered to God as our sacrifice through the great High-priest, who offered himself to God in his passion for us, that we might be members of this glorious head, according to the form of a servant."—*City of God*, x, 6. In the form of a servant, he chose rather to be than to receive a sacrifice. Thus he is both the priest who offers and the sacrifice offered, (x, 20.) "He was able to expiate sins by dying, because he both died and not for sin of his own."—x, 24. "There was need for a mediator, that is, for a reconciler, who by the offering of one sacrifice, of which all the sacrifices of the law and the prophets were types, should take away this wrath" [of God.]—*The Enchiridion*, chap. xxxiii.

Augustine also emphasized all the essential features of what is called the moral theory of the atonement, in the deeper sense in which that theory is held by those who acknowledge the proper divinity of Christ. He discovers a profound moral power in the divine humility exhibited through the cross. "It was expedient," says he, "that a mediator, who alone of the human race was born, lived, and died without sin, should reconcile us to God, and procure even for our bodies a resurrection to eternal life, in order that the pride of man might be exposed and cured by the humility of God, [and] that an example might be set to disobedient man in the life of obedience of the God-man."—*Enchirid.*, chap. cviii. With especial stress Augustine sets forth the moral power of the divine love revealed in Christ. He suggests that "it was mainly for this purpose that Christ came, to wit, that man might learn how much God loves him." "What greater reason," he asks, "is apparent for the advent of the Lord than that God might show his love in us, commending it powerfully, inasmuch as 'while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' And, furthermore, this is with the intent that, inasmuch as charity is 'the end of the commandment," and 'the fulfilling of the law,' we also may love one another, and lay down our life for the brethren, even as he laid down his life for us. And with regard to God himself, its object is that, even if it were an irksome task to love him, it may now at least cease to be irksome for us to return his love, seeing that 'he first loved us,' and 'spared not his only Son, but delivered him up for us all;' for there is no mightier invitation to love than to anticipate in loving."—*Catechising*, chap. iv.

Leo the Great and Gregory the Great held substantially the same theory as Augustine respecting the claim of Sātan and the manner in which it was canceled. If the idea that Satan was outwitted was too agreeable that they should pass it by altogether, it did not essentially modify their theory. The deception, in their view, did not at all concern the terms of a contract; was simply the liability of misconception imposed upon the rash and malicious adversary by Christ's human appearance. It is to be observed, also, that Gregory, however distinctly he confesses the claim of Satan, betrays a suspicion that it is not much of a claim after all. In one passage he styles it a *quasi* justice by which Satan held man—(*quasi*

*juste tenuit hominem.*) This appears like a plain suggestion of the interpretation given by Peter Lombard, one of the last to tolerate the phraseology of a right in Satan. He says: "Unjustly did the devil, so far as he himself was concerned, hold man, but man was justly held, because, while the devil never deserved to have power over man, man deserved through his transgression to suffer the tyranny of the devil." Here the right of the devil is set down as simply God's right to punish man by leaving him under Satanic power; that is, no right at all in the devil himself.

As to the teaching of those who succeeded Gregory the Great, we have the following statement from Baur: "While, according to Augustine, the devil had the full property right upon men, Leo the Great declared it at least a tyrannical right, and Gregory the Great, although, on the one hand, he could not deny the reality of the right, on the other, declared it a merely seeming right, and the following teachers of the Church, without laying any special stress upon the idea of right, remain rather by the indefinite representation that man, in consequence of his sin, fell into the power of the devil."—*Versöhn.*, p. 68.

Thus it is seen that it cannot properly be said that the Latin Church, even from Augustine to Anselm, to say nothing about the preceding centuries, taught that the redemptive price was paid to Satan. The natural implications of such a statement are not found to be fulfilled. While the leading theologians of the West, after the fourth century, allowed a certain claim in Satan upon fallen man, they neither assumed the existence of a contract with Satan nor of an exchange in answer to that contract; and, moreover, they made prominent other and very different features of Christ's saving office.

The inquiry how an acknowledgment of a claim in Satan gained the degree of currency that it did is not altogether easy to answer. But at least some intimations are at hand. From what is long and even fiercely opposed there is often an unconscious borrowing through the simple influence of close contact. Writers who contended against the Gnostics may have been tempted to borrow a little from their representations of the Demiurge—his rule over men and his unwitting defeat of himself through the death of the Messiah, only applying to

Satan what the Gnostics had previously ascribed to Jehovah or the Demiurge. (See, for example, Marcion's view in Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 176, 177.) The idea that heathenism was under the patronage of demons, joined with the experience of awful persecutions from the heathen power, tended to give most vivid impressions of the might of Satanic rule. Hence, when an adventurous writer like Origen, borrowing his suggestion from the Gnostics, or (what is quite as possible) from an imperfect exegesis of the Bible, had once started the theory of a right in Satan over fallen men, and of a ransom from his possession through Christ, it was too much in line with the sentiments of the age not to receive a degree of countenance.

As the review may have served to indicate, the Church fathers combined many aspects in their total view of Christ's saving office. Upon no one feature was an exclusive emphasis laid. Abundant expression was given to the idea that Christ's holy obedience and death were a most precious tribute to divine justice; but it was not emphasized relatively as much as it has been since the time of Anselm. It may be doubted whether it was the current idea among the theologians of these centuries that the divine nature in itself permitted of no other method of salvation than the one chosen—absolutely required the mediational work of a God-man as a condition of pardon. (See quotations from Athanasius and others in Baur's Versöhn., pp. 84, 85.) The subject was reviewed more from the ground of superlative fitness than of absolute necessity—more from the stand-point of the requirements of wise and salutary administration than of the demands of the divine nature. Probably the great majority would willingly have subscribed to the statement of the master theologian of the West: "We must show," says Augustine, "not, indeed, that no other mode was possible to God, to whose power all things are equally subject, but that there neither was nor need have been any other mode more appropriate for curing our misery. For what was so necessary for the building up of our hope, and for the freeing the minds of mortals, cast down by the condition of mortality itself, from despair of immortality, than that it should be demonstrated to us at how great a price God rated us, and how greatly he loved us?"—*On the Trinity*, xiii, 10.

## ART. IX. — SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN CATHOLIC REVIEW, April, 1878. (Philadelphia.)—1. Secret Societies in the United States. 2. Spiritualism versus Materialism. 3. Religious Communities: The Present Policy of the Holy See, particularly regarding Religious Communities having but Simple Vows. 4. The Mental Capacity of the American Indian as indicated by his Speech. 5. The Periodical Literature of the Day, and its Tendencies. 6. Emotion. 7. Pope Alexander the Sixth and his Original Traducers. 8. Pius the Ninth and his Pontificate.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1878. (Andover.)—1. Rothe on Dogmatics, Revelation, and Scripture. 2. Aristotle. 3. Christ's Words on the Duration of Future Punishment. 4. Horae Samaritanae; or, A Collection of various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other ancient Versions. 5. The Extent of Inspiration. 6. "Is Eternal Punishment Endless?" 7. Mr. Joseph Cook's Lectures on Biology and Transcendentalism. 8. The Organic Reunion of Churches.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, January, 1878. (Boston.) 1. John S. C. Abbott. 2. Books and their Uses. 3. Ritschl's Critical History of the Doctrine of Justification. 4. Congregational Necrology.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, April, 1878. (Gettysburgh.)—1. A Question Touching the Augsburg Confession. 2. Neurology and the Human Soul. 3. A Study of Francis Xavier. 4. Guarantees of Faith. 5. What is the Duty of the Church toward her Delinquent Members. 6. Adam. 7. The Scribes Before and in the Time of Christ. 8. The Higher Education Without God.

NEW-ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, April, 1878. (Boston.) —1. Biographical Sketch of Nathan C. Keep, M.D., D.M.D. 2. Letter of Rev. Experience Mayhew, 1758. 3. Notes on the Hon. John Adams of Nova Scotia and Boston. 4. Church Record of the Rev. Hugh Adams of Durham, N. H. 5. Address of the Hon. Marshal P. Wilder before the N. E. Historic Genealogical Society. 6. Autobiography of William Rotch. 7. Taxes under Gov. Andros. 8. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison, 1777–79. 9. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown, Mass. 10. Longmeadow, Mass., Families. 11. The Perrin Family. 12. Abstracts of Early Deeds in Boston. 13. Prison Ships and Old Mill Prison, Plymouth, England. 14. The Waite Family of Malden. 15. Abstracts of Earliest Wills in Suffolk County, Mass. 16. Genealogy of the Eustis Family. 17. Supplement to the Diodati Family.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, May–June, 1878. (New York.)—1. Is the Republican Party in its Death-Struggle? 2. The Sovereignty of Ethics. 3. Commercial Relations with France. 4. Discipline in American Colleges. 5. The Army of the United States. Part II. 6. Is Man a Depraved Creature? 7. The Irrepressible Conflict undecided. 8. Chinese Immigration. 9. The Phonograph and its Future.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, April, 1878. (Baltimore.)—1. The Christian Cosmos. 2. Mrs. Abigail Adams. 3. Christian Liberty. 4. Edwards on the Will. 5. Charles Kingsley. 6. How Gettysburgh was Lost. 7. The Creeds of Christendom. 8. Dr. Dabney and Dr. Bledsoe.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1878. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Church Discipline. 2. Divine Justice. 3. The Delay of Salvation. 4. An Inquiry Concerning John's Baptism. 5. The Origin of Sin. 6. Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History. 7. Infant Baptism and its Underlying Doctrines. 8. The Second International Sunday-School Convention.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, April, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Erigena and Universalism. 2. Man as Affected by his Surroundings. 3. The Book of Enoch. 4. Lewes' Foundation of a Creed. 5. Science Against Darwinism. 6. Preachers and Sermons. 7. The Committed Word.

The able editor of the Universalist Quarterly, Dr. Thayer, is pasturing in the richest of clover. He has gathered a series of passages indicating that there is a calm but very general reaction in the Protestant Church from the Genevan and Edwardean view of hell-fire, and anticipates as possible "a great land-slide into Universalism," or, at any rate, "toward" it. And this reaction discloses itself not from heterodox quarters, but from central evangelicism and from towering high-churchism. Of this reaction, as the attentive readers of our Quarterly are cognizant, we have been editorially prescient in past years; have spoken of it with a clearness and freedom exhibited in no other "orthodox" periodical; and yet without viewing it as any "slide" towards Universalism, or any departure from the doctrine of the irreversible ruin of the finally impenitent. We looked upon what we called "our stern Protestant eschatology" as a specialty in the Church, and not the universality. As to the Roman Church, in our notice of Priest Walworth's pamphlet we noticed that the predominant doctrine seemed to be that eternal penalty was according to character; and that characters of high moral and intellectual, yet not truly spiritual, cast, were in a state of eternal fruition suited to their nature, yet excluded from the pure vision of God which is truly the only heaven, and so were in "hell." This was the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. Yet the Roman Church left it an open question. Every Romanist is free to believe or preach the Edwardean hell on his own responsibility. But authoritatively Rome taught the doctrine of purgatory, which, so far as the believers were concerned, was essential restorationism. In the Anglican Church the doctrine of eternal misery was explicitly struck from the obligatory Articles of Faith. The peremptory prescription of eternal materialistic hell-fire as the solely permissible belief comes, as we believe, from Geneva, and is part of "the doctrinal deformation of the Reformation" of which we spoke in a former Quarterly. Yet, whatever have been the authoritative prescriptions in the Church, the great body of believers has, with marked unanimity, in all past ages, held to

the doctrine of irreversible penalty and endless doom.* And this we believe to be the true basis: agreement as to eternal penalty, with freedom as to its nature and degree. If our Wesleyan-Arminian bodies maintain this position of unity and freedom, we do not apprehend any "land-slide into Universalism."

## *English Reviews.*

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1878. (London.)—1. The Origin and Growth of Sunday-schools in England. 2. The Laws of India. 3. M. Renan—the History of a Mind. 4. The Reading and Rendering of Romans v. 1. 5. Christian Theism. 6. The Vatican Council. 7. Conditional Immortality. 8. Didsbury Sermons.

QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1878. (London: New York reprint.)—1. The Crown and the Constitution. 2. The Church in the West Riding. 3. Giordano Bruno and Galileo Galilei. 4. Naval Education. 5. The Princes of India and the Proclamation of the Empire. 6. The Legislation of the Commonwealth. 7. Life and Times of James Madison. 8. Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 9. The Aggression of Russia and the Duty of Great Britain.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, April, 1878. (New York reprint.)—1. Sir Erskine May's Democracy in Europe. 2. Barry Cornwall's Life and Poems. 3. Skepticism in Geology. 4. Three Scottish Teachers. 5. Browning's Agamemnon and Campbell's Trachiniæ. 6. The Age of Bronze. 7. A Noble Queen. 8. The Naval Strength of England. 9. Torrens' Memoirs of Lord Melbourne. 10. The Present and the Future of the East.

This number contains two articles on archæology, or what we may call pre-Adamitism; and both, though written by persistent believers in the geologic man, are remarkable for their apologies for scientistic "extravagances," and for their retractions from positions that a few years since were asserted with peremptory and sublime arrogance against all who ventured to stand firm to Genesis in preference to the last boast of false science. "In the pursuit of a study so new," we are now told, "so fascinating, and so positive in its bases, it was to be expected that error and extravagances should at first occur." "It is as a volunteer in this contest that the author of 'Skepticism in Geology' has made a spirited and well-executed attack on what he terms 'certain excrescences on the great and incon-

* Quite remarkable are the words of the eminent Jesuit Petavius, as quoted by Dr. Newman, in his "Grammar of Assent," and which we venture to translate thus: "Concerning this revival (respiratione) of even damned men, nothing certain has as yet been decreed by the Catholic Church; for which reason this opinion of some most holy fathers must not be exploded as absurd; although it is foreign from the common feeling of Catholics at this time."

trovertible truths of geology, which aim at proving the earth to have been fashioned by mechanical processes still going on.'"

REBUKES OF SCIENTISTIC ANTI-BIBLICISM.

In somewhat of timid circumlocution the Review acknowledges that the real motive for a vast amount of this pretended zeal for science is anti-biblical. "We fear that the unrivaled popularity that has hailed the appearance of certain works which have propounded new theories, or carried old theories to new results, with reference to the organized species of the natural kingdoms, has not been due, in the main, to a genuine interest in natural science. It is idle to disguise the fact that the contest in its present phase, although it may be unfair to say that it is carried on under false colors, is one which concerns the safety of positions of a very different importance from the outposts around which the skirmish as yet rages." We wish the writer had said this in a franker style. He might have said that of the rampant "enthusiasm" of pre-Adamite scientists there is one part love for science to three parts eager infidelity. This is by no means predicable of all who have been put to pause by the fallacious assumptions and false "facts" of the paleontologists. That calm pause, that waiting for fuller and decisive development of facts, was scientifically and morally right. But there has been a large amount of scientistic unscrupulousness. False assumptions and modes of reasoning have been elaborately adopted, and facts have been manipulated in behalf of pre-Adamitism with a very suspicious carelessness. An intolerant scientific popery has issued its roaring bulls, requiring every scientific man to accept certain conclusions under penalty of losing caste, and scouting every non-professional doubter as an enemy of science. The result has been, we fear, in not a few cases, that professedly Christian thinkers and scientists have been "bull-dozed" not only into submission, but even into an adoption of the "enthusiasm" and arrogance of their "bull-dozers."

REBUKE OF ATHEISMS MIXED WITH SCIENCE.

Our Review, however, does utter some trenchant rebukes even against such men as Darwin and Huxley for their corrupt mixing of an atheistic philosophy, which is purely subjective, with actual science reposing on objective facts. In the

following passage the italics are our own: "The weapons of skepticism are used in our times with great effect to assail and shake some of the fundamental principles of morality and religion. We must say that we feel at least an equal amount of skepticism in relation to many of the dogmas of modern science. They are, many of them, as we have said, mere hypotheses; there is an admitted failure of evidence to raise them to the rank of demonstrated truths; but *they are promulgated and proclaimed with an arrogance and intolerance worthy of the infallible priesthood of an absolute creed. There is, in truth, more reason in these days to complain of the intolerance of science than of the intolerance of religion.* Few names in science are more illustrious than that of Dr. Virchow, but the services he has rendered to his art are, in our judgment, surpassed by the service he has rendered to truth in the vigorous protest delivered by him at Munich last autumn against 'the tyranny of dogmatism which undertakes to master the whole view of nature by the premature generalizing of theoretical combinations.' A very large proportion of these daring hypotheses are literally unsupported by facts, and even opposed to facts; and we cannot sufficiently applaud the manly and independent spirit in which Dr. Virchow rejects the attempt to inculcate these unsettled opinions as fundamental truths. His discourse well deserves the honor of translation, and we hope it will be generally read."

The following rebukes administered to the Darwinian and Huxleyan atheism interpolated into science we quote in full:—

Thus we find one writer, distinguished for an erudition in natural history of a high order, bringing forward all his learning, and taxing all his reasoning powers, to support the assertion that "the most distinct genera and orders within the same great class —for instance, whales, mice, birds, and fishes—are all the descendants of one common progenitor, and we must admit that the whole vast amount of difference between these forms of life has primarily arisen from simple variability." The truth which underlies this ridiculous over-statement is, that a certain general type, platform, or design may be recognized as underlying the vertebrated form of life, and as developed with wonderful diversity, so as to suit different conditions of abode, of food, and even of medium of life. The idea of the "common progenitor" is not only purely gratuitous, but is one so opposed to all the phenomena of the distribution of animal life, and, indeed, so far transcending the limits which physical science imposes on the conceivable duration of life on our planet, that it is difficult to imagine why a writer should

have weighted his argument with so unnecessary an approach to a mathematical absurdity. In such a sentence as we have quoted the term "variability" ceases to have any scientific meaning. As to the object with which it was introduced, however, we are not left in doubt. "No shadow of reason," Mr. Darwin continues, "can be assigned for the belief, alike in nature, and the result of the same general laws which have been the groundwork, through natural selection, of the formation of the most perfectly adapted animals in the world, man included, were intentionally and specially guided." We think that it is tolerably evident that the interest excited by the desire to justify or to condemn such an utterance as the above has little claim to the title of scientific interest.

It is plain that two entirely distinct issues are raised in the words which we have quoted from one of the later works of Mr. Darwin, in language which has, at all events, the rare merit of being both intelligible and precise. The first (and, as we have said, gratuitously conditioned) demand on our assent is the thesis that all forms of animal life, as far at least as the *Vertebrata* are concerned, have been derived, by the ordinary process of descent, from a common ancestor. The second, and no less gratuitous, proposition is, that during the long descent, through a series of transformations which could only have been possible in consequence of the primary provision of adaptability, no direct, creative, providential, or divine design has been kept in view; that no controlling wisdom has directed, or rendered possible, the course of development; but that man has been evolved out of a fish, a sponge, or a speck of jelly, by the preservation, during the battle for life, of varieties which possess any advantage in structure, constitution, or instinct. It is important, as giving the fullest exposition of this view, to cite the words of Mr. Huxley: "A nucleated mass of protoplasm turns out to be what may be termed the structural unit of the human body. As a matter of fact, the body, in its earliest state, is a mere multiple of such units; and in its perfect condition it is a multiple of such units variously modified." "All vital action may, with equal propriety, be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative or correlative in the not living matter which gives rise to it?"

When we find writers thus laboriously go out of their way, content to part company with the sobriety of reason, so that they may administer a slap in the face to what they may regard as an inconvenient superstition, are we not fully justified in the statement that the popularity their works have attained is mainly due to something very different from the desire of the mass of their readers to be enlightened in the truths of physical science? Nothing is more contrary to true scientific method than the confusion of theory and of facts, or the transplanting to one order of inves-

tigation of details appertaining to a totally different field of research. Thus it may be possible to state in terms, or, perhaps, even in some queer sense to hold, the low and semi-brutal theory that no proofs of wise purpose and design are to be drawn from that perfect adaptation of type to conditions of existence which forms the general law of organic nature. But we might expect that a student afflicted with so unfortunate a form of intellectual color-blindness would be careful, by a judicious silence, not to draw attention to his damaging deficiency. When, on the contrary, we find him volunteer a statement so wide of the mark as to say that not "a shadow of reason can be assigned" for a more symmetric and more complete view of nature, we feel at once that we can accept no statement at his hands without control or verification. Again: we might expect that a man sufficiently familiar with the rudiments of chemistry to be able to describe in terms of scientific notation the chemical elements of protoplasm, would be one of the first to be aware that there was a something in living matter which is not to be found in the carbon, and oxygen, and hydrogen, and nitrogen, of which he tells us that such matter consists. It is a something which he cannot by any means detect in non-living matter. He is unable to put it into any similar mixture, with whatever accuracy he may compound it. It is precisely the presence of "a something which has no representative or correlative in the not living matter" which composes the contents of an egg, that makes the difference between an addled and a good egg—a difference which, on the argument of Mr. Huxley, would be altogether imaginary, or, at all events, entirely unaccountable.—Pp. 185–187.

The following is an important passage:—

ASTRONOMY CONTRADICTS DARWINISM.

The author of "Skepticism in Geology" has not referred to the most powerful arguments yet adduced against what is called the uniformitarian theory. Geology, whatever be its actual advance, is but one branch of natural science. Not only must any sound geological theory, therefore, be in accordance with the ascertained truths of natural philosophy, but it must be controlled by those more general and more certain data which are to be obtained by the physicist and by the physical astronomer. The address delivered to the Geological Society of Glasgow, (Feb. 27, 1868,) by Sir W. Thomson, "On Geological Time," has laid down certain lines and limits which no reasonable speculator can attempt to overstep. By reasoning as lucid as that of the *Principia* itself, Sir William has demonstrated the fact that a secular retardation of the rotation of the earth is caused by the tides. A second and independent proof that geological time is limited, deduced from the laws of heat, is to be found in the paper "On Geological Dynamics," by the same author, read to the same audience on February 19, 1869. In this Professor Huxley's address

to the Geological Society of London, (Feb. 19, 1869,) is submitted to a damaging ,or, rather, totally destructive, criticism. From these masterly papers it is clearly evident that the enormous demands on time made by the uniformitarian geologists, so far from being based on any observed phenomena, are irreconcilable with an intelligent consideration of physical law. Almost every thing, in fact, points to the conclusion *that the erosive, transporting, and upheaving actions of nature were formerly far more active than is now the case.* One thing alone stands on the opposite side of the question. The contrast is thus stated by Sir W. Thomson: "The limitation of geological periods, imposed by physical science, cannot, of course, disprove the hypothesis of transmutation of species; but it does seem sufficient to disprove the doctrine that transmutation has taken place through 'descent with modification by natural selection.'" The only necessity for the assumption that "a far longer period than 300,000,000 years has elapsed since the latter part of the secondary period" is to give time for the operation of that law which has been invented by Mr. Darwin, and which is thus proved to be inconsistent with well-known and established principles of natural science.—Pp. 196.

This unequivocal reaffirmation of Thomson's positions is pregnant with decisive results: 1. Darwin and his followers are obliged to demand immense periods of time, and to give us prolix lectures on "the imperfection of the geological record." But, alas! astronomy limits their time, cramps their action, and squeezes the whole theory to death. 2. It demonstrates that *we are now in a comparatively repose period;* that geological convulsions and "catastrophes" have been far more violent and gigantic than now. This seriously affects the doctrine of pre-Adamitism. Those changes which have happened since Adam appeared are, many of them, the result of violent action, not of protracted time. Pre-Adamitism is largely based upon uniformitarianism carried to fanaticism.

In closing our notice of this valuable article we should say that the writer still holds to the pre-Adamite man. His reason for this opinion (given in an extract from "Haughton's Geology") is, "that man lived in this country and throughout Western Europe with the lion and hairy elephant, the hyena and woolly rhinoceros. . . . In his weapons of warfare and of the chase he resembled the dwellers on the shores of arctic seas; and, judging from the associated animals, he probably lived in an age when continental conditions and higher mountains produced much greater extremes of climate than are

found in the same countries now." For the value of such reasons we recommend our readers to consult Mr. Southall's "Epoch of the Mammoth," noticed upon another page of this number of our Quarterly. In our own opinion the reviewer has made admissions enough to overthrow his assigned reason very abundantly.

The article on the "Age of Bronze" is marked by the same abandonment of peremptory positions. The writer still holds to a "paleolithic" or old-stone period, when men used very rude flint instruments, and to a "neolithic" or new-stone period, when men used implements of a more polished character; and that these two periods were each ages long, and with long ages intervening between the two.

THE PALEOLITHIC AGE.

The paleolithic age, when man was living along with the extinct animals in Europe, is separated from the second period in the history of mankind, or that of polished stone, by an interval which can only be measured by geographical change and the disappearance of some and the extinction of other animals. It was sufficiently great to allow of Great Britain becoming separated from the Continent by the submergence of the great plains connecting it with Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and France, and to allow of the mammoth, cave-bear, woolly rhinoceros, and other creatures, to become extinct. In it the paleolithic hunter disappeared without any sign of overlap with his neolithic successors. This may possibly be due to the same kind of antagonism between them as that existing now between the Eskimos and Red Indians, which keeps them completely isolated from each other. But, whether this explanation be true or not, there is no transition observable between the paleolithic and neolithic implements and art, just as there is no relation between the wild animals which supplied the former with food, and the domestic animals of his successor the herdsman.—P. 228.

The *time sufficient to separate Britain from the Continent* makes a highly sonorous impression! But, 1. So paleolithic an author as Professor Giekie is quoted by Southall as saying: "An elevation of from twenty to thirty fathoms would drain nearly all the German Ocean between England and the Continent, and twenty fathoms more would lay dry the same sea between Scotland and Denmark." How long does a subsidence of one hundred and fifty feet require? Perhaps a few days or even hours. Professor Winchell furnishes us in

his pamphlet, noticed on another page, with a far greater geologic revolution than this, wrought since the days of Abraham. The continent of Atlantis was sunk beneath the ocean's surface subsequently to 1582 B. C. Whether sunk by sudden convulsions or slow immersion, Atlantis left behind it, as its sole remnants, the Canary Islands and the now extinct race of Guanches. Yet our uniformitarian brethren still prattle about the impossibility of stupendous geological changes during the Adamic period! 2. The reviewer himself suggests that the paleolithic and neolithic races might, nevertheless, be contemporaneous, yet separate, like the present Eskimo and Red Indians. Of course they might, and therefore the assumption that they were ages apart is a gratuity. There are plenty of instances in which stone-using races are contemporaneous and friendly with metal-using races, without themselves using metals. The same race, even, uses worse and better stone implements. In fact, the great mass of implements in the so-called neolithic finds are of paleolithic rudeness. The genius of Nast ought to picture for us a modern paleolithist sorting out from a pile of stone implements the smoothest and most finished specimens, labeling them neolithic, and libeling the unfortunate remainder as paleolithic. 3. The closing paragraph of the reviewer pretty much concedes the whole question. He says:—

> Our readers will see further from this review that the division into ages of polished stone, bronze, and iron, is merely relative, and *does not imply periods, using the term in the historical sense.* In the transalpine region the pre-historic times extended far down into the historic period of Greece and Rome. We would advise the archæologists as well as the historians to concentrate their attention on this overlap.—P. 245.

That states the truth precisely. The implements, whether stone, bronze, or iron, are a proximate test of civilization, but a very imperfect measure of time.

The reviewer's survey of the primeval inhabitants of Europe is worth noticing. The paleolithic race he identifies with the Eskimos. And Mr. Southall would add, linguistics have identified the Eskimos with the old Acadians, the earliest race that inhabited the Babylonian tetrapolis:—

> The route by which they retreated from Europe is indicated by the remains of that animal, which lie scattered in the fossil state

through Germany and Russia to the frozen cliffs of Behring's Straits and the present land of the Eskimos. As archæological inquiry goes on in Northern Siberia we feel certain that implements and weapons will be met with similar to those of the caves of Middle and Northern Europe.—P. 228.

The neolithic race he identifies as the old Iberian :—

The researches of Professor Huxley and Dr. Thurman in this country, and Professor Busk in Spain and Gibraltar, prove that the neolithic Britons are identical with that small, dark-haired, long-headed, elegant section of the Basque-speaking peoples which are now found in the south of France and the north of Spain. The human skeletons of the neolithic tombs of the whole of Britain and Ireland, treated in the same way as a naturalist would treat any other group of remains, indicate unmistakably that there was a population possessed of all the physical characters of the small, dark Iberi now represented by the inhabitants of Guipuscoa and the surrounding districts. The same type has been met with in sepulchral caves in Belgium and in certain districts of France, and as far south in Spain as the Sierra Nevada. It has been met with also in the caves of Gibraltar. Thus there is evidence that in the neolithic age a population indistinguishable from the Iberian extended over the region north of the Mediterranean to the ocean, and to the east as far as the Rhine.—P. 233.

The entire survey confirms the bibical statements that the populations streamed toward western Europe from western Asia. The east is the cradle of the race. First came the Eskimo, driven westward by the Iberian; the Iberian, by the Celt, and the Celts now hold the western margin as Frenchmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen. For the Celt was driven westward by the Teuton or German, who now holds central Europe. And at this day the German is pressed upon by the Sclavonian, for Russia is now the eastern menace of western Europe.

NO LATE PROGRESS MADE TOWARD PRE-ADAMITISM.

We have the following discouraging statement of the somewhat dilapidated state of the geologic man :—

The debate at the Anthropological Institute in May last leaves the question of the antiquity of man now just where it was twenty years ago. The attempt made by the glacialists to push back man into an interglacial period has signally failed. The asserted discovery of man in association with the extinct animals in the Victoria Cave in Yorkshire turns out to be founded on a mistake, and the interglacial age of the flint implements at Brandon is dis-

puted by high authorities, among which may be numbered the Professors of Geology at Oxford and Cambridge. Nor do we get any light thrown upon this question on the Continent. The four little sticks found in the interglacial lignite of Dürnten, and considered by Professors Rütimeyer and Schwendauer to be fragments of a fossil basket, are, in our opinion, after a careful examination, devoid of all trace of man's handiwork. We believe them to be pineknots out of a rotten trunk, similar in every respect to those which may be seen in any rotten fir-tree in which the decay has gone on sufficiently to allow of their falling out. The reputed discovery of man in pleiocene deposits in Tuscany is equally unsatisfactory, since it is not certain that the cut bones, on which it is founded, were discovered in undisturbed strata. It seems to us that great caution should be used at the present time in accepting any evidence as to the antiquity of man, which many are so eager to push as far back as possible. Unless we have the most ample confirmation of the presence of man in remote geological periods, it is merely an act of common prudence to carry all asserted discoveries to a suspense account.—P. 227.

We call particular attention to the failure of a number of enthusiastic hunts after "the pre-glacial man." Southall furnishes a fuller notice; but Dawson's work, noticed in our last Quarterly, enumerates and repudiates all the specimens of the "pre-glacial." Pre-adamitism, however, in order to keep its courage up, mixes up a little prophecy with science. The long-lost LEMURIA is the paradise of its hope. That other sunken continent, on the east of Africa, of which Madagascar is the remaining memento, will yet turn up the spectacle of lemurs budding into apes, and apes blossoming into men, through which the sighing scientist will yet be able to trace his own pedigree back to the tadpole and the squirt. Said scientist is truly "Japhet in search of his father."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1878. (New York.)—1. The Literature of the Servians and Croats. 2. Popular Buddhism according to the Chinese Canon. 3. An Indian District: Its People and Administration. 4. Peasant Life in France and Russia. 5. Our Present Convict System. 6. Life of the Prince Consort. 7. Russian Aggression and the Duty of Europe.

No ethnic religion can compare in interest to the student and thinker with BUDDHISM. Of the thousand millions of men nearly one half are its devotees. Its founder is, perhaps, the most wonderful man of mere men. Its morals are ascetically pure. The following, from Article II, shows the most authentic source of our knowledge as to Chinese Buddhism :—

THE LONDON LIBRARY OF BUDDHIST SCRIPTURES.

In the year 1875 there was delivered, at the Library of the India Office in London, a collection of books in seven large boxes, carefully packed in lead, with padding of dry rushes and grass. The books are the Buddhist Tripitaka in Chinese characters, with Japanese notations, issued in Japan, with an Imperial Preface, in the years 1681–1683 A. D. The entire series of two thousand volumes is contained in one hundred and three cases or covers. When placed in the library, they required eleven shelves of ten feet in length. This was the magnificent gift of the Japanese Government to England, made on the suggestion of the embassador who had recently visited Europe. He had doubtless been struck by the anomaly between the intense desire of the English to convert the heathen, and their profound ignorance of all religions except their own, and especially of the one which most closely resembles it, the state religion of his own country, Buddhism. Mr. Beal and Dr. Rost requested him to solicit the gift. No more appropriate gift could have been sent; and the Secretary of State directed the Rev. Samuel Beal, Professor of Chinese in the University of London, to prepare a "compendious report of the Buddhist Tripitaka." The result of his labors is the catalogue *raisonné* now before us. Professor Beal is well known as one of the first Buddhist scholars in Europe, and he had already reported upon the Chinese books in the Library of the India Office.

The importance of the Chinese copy of the Buddhist canonical scriptures lies in the fact that it was commenced in the first century A. D. The translation was made from the Sanskrit, or from some Indian vernacular, by early Buddhist missionaries from India to China.

Like Socrates and other great religious teachers, Buddha taught only by word of mouth. Immediately after his death his disciples assembled in conclave to recall and commit to memory the words of the master. These "words" were, like the Vedas, handed down from disciple to disciple, until they were finally committed to writing. They were divided into three parts, or *baskets*, Tripitika: (1.) Doctrinal and practical discourses; (2.) Ecclesiastical discipline for the religious orders; (3.) Metaphysics and philosophy. So long as the words of Buddha were handed down by oral tradition there was danger of heresies and false teaching; therefore, about the year 246 B. C., King Asoka, who stood to Buddhism in a relation similar to that of the Emperor Constantine to Christianity, summoned a council to fix the canon. This council was to India what the Council of Nice became to Europe. The assembled fathers, who numbered a thousand, received the excellent advice from the king, that they should seek only for the words of the master himself; for "that which is spoken by the blessed Buddha, and that alone, is well spoken." The canon drawn up by this council is the one accepted by the Southern Buddhists of Ceylon, Siam, and Burmah. None of the Pitikas

can be traced back with certainty to an earlier date, although they contain matter which is much older. The Northern canon, which is somewhat larger than the Southern, was fixed at a council held in Kashmeer about the commencement of the Christian era. The Chinese is translated from this Northern canon; and many of the monasteries in China contain complete copies of the scriptures in the vernacular, and also of the Sanskrit originals from which the Chinese version was made. Great impetus to the work of translation was given by the influx of Buddhist missionaries on the conversion of the Chinese monarch in the middle of the first century of our era. Thus, at the very time when Christianity was being carried westward into Europe by St. Paul and his companions, Buddhism was being carried eastward into China by missionaries no less courageous and zealous for the faith which they believed.

As Buddha did not claim any revelation, so the canon stands alone among the sacred scriptures of the world in not assuming any special inspiration for its contents: "For the attainment of those previously unknown doctrines, the eye, the knowledge, the wisdom, and the light, were developed within me."—Pp. 156, 157.

### THE PERSONALITY OF BUDDHA.

In the fifth century B. C. there arose in the civilized world the remarkable intellectual movement of which Pythagoras is the representative in Europe, Zoroaster in Persia, Buddha in India, Confucius in China. Buddha is more fortunate than the others in having bequeathed to the world not only words of wisdom, as did they, but also the example of a life in which the loftiest morality was softened and beautified by unbounded charity and devotion to the good of his fellow-men. His walk through life was along "the path whose entrance is purity, whose goal is love." The personality of the Buddha is still a living power in the world, and by its exquisite purity it attracts the heart and affection of more than one third of the human race.

Buddha is not, strictly speaking, the name of a man. The word means "The Enlightened," and is the title applied to a succession of men whose wisdom has enlightened mankind. It has, however, become identified with the founder of Buddhism, Gautama. Buddhists think it irreverent to say the word "Gautama," so they speak of him as the Buddha, Sakya-muni, "the sage of the Sakyas," "the lion of the tribe of Sakya," "the king of righteousness," "the blessed one." Gautama, then, is *the* Buddha, and his followers have been called Buddhists from the characteristic feature of the founder's office—he who enlightens mankind. Gautama claimed to be nothing more than a link in the chain of Buddhas who had preceded and who should follow him. This modest claim is characteristic of great reformers: "I only hand on, I cannot create new things; I believe in the ancients." Mohammed claimed to return to the creed of Abraham, "the Friend." Nevertheless, the glory of a religion belongs to the

founder, not to his predecessors nor his successors. He it is who makes all things new; and, therefore, it is to the life and teaching of Gautama that we must look for the mainspring of the religion. Buddha is one of the few founders of religion who did not claim a special revelation or inspiration. "I have heard these truths from no one," he said; "they are all self-revealed—they spring only from within myself." And he believed them to be true for all time: "The heavens may fall to earth, the earth become dust, the mountains may be removed, but my word cannot fail or be false."

Buddha commenced his preaching at the city of Benares, on the banks of the Ganges, where Brahminism was the religion of the mass of the people. He was a reformer. His reformation bears to Brahminism the relation which Protestantism bears to Roman Catholicism, rather than that which Christianity does to Judaism, though it may be doubted whether a schism actually took place during Buddha's life-time. It was primarily a protest against the sacrificial and sacerdotal system of the Brahmans. It rejected all bloody sacrifice, together with the priesthood and social caste so essentially bound up with them. The logical consequence of animal sacrifice he admirably showed in the words: "If a man, in worshiping the gods, sacrifices a sheep, and so does well, why should he not kill his child, his relations, or his dearest friend, in worshiping the gods, and so do better?" But, while Buddhism was opposed to sacerdotalism, it was in close alliance with the teaching of the philosophers, for all its main positions may be traced to their origin in the teaching of the philosophical schools of India. Buddha states and accepts the high aim of these schools: "All the different systems of philosophy are designed to one end—to overthrow the strongholds of sin." He endeavored to popularize this end of the philosophy of the day, and to bring it within the comprehension of the poorest and most outcast of the people. Indeed, one secret of his success lay in the fact that he preached to the poor as well as to the rich, and that the common people heard him gladly.

The personal influence of Buddha while he lived, the enthusiasm for humanity with which he inspired his followers, the attractive beauty of character which he bequeathed as "a rich legacy" to mankind, place him as the central figure of his religion. The result has been that he has been idealized until he is regarded as divine and omniscient and free from all sin. "There is no deity above him; he stands out alone, unrivaled, unequaled, and unapproachable." Prayers are addressed to him, flowers and incense offered, and his relics are enshrined in stupas. Nevertheless, Gautama stands but as one in a long chain of Buddhas who have preceded him, and who will follow. His teaching was higher and nobler than the teaching of those who came before him. The teaching of the Buddhas who will in the course of ages follow will be greater and more divine than was his. Therefore he bade men look forward to and hail their advent. The next Buddha

will be Maitreya, the Buddha of charity. It is difficult to fix the exact date of Buddha's death. It may have been as early as 477, or as late as 412 B. C.—Pp. 157, 168.

The following paragraph shows almost amusingly the

CHRISTIAN ESTIMATES OF BUDDHA.

Christians of all shades of opinion have spoken with reverence of Buddha. The Venetian Marco Polo said, "Indeed, had he been a Christian, he would have been a great saint of our Lord Jesus Christ, so good and pure was the life he led;" and he tells us how pilgrims came to Adam's Peak in Ceylon, "from very long distances, with great devotion, just as Christians go to the shrine of Messer Saint James in Gallicia." M. St. Hilaire says, "Je n'hésite pas à ajouter que, sauf le Christ tout seul, il n'est point, parmi les fondateurs de religion, de figure plus pure ni plus touchante que celle de Bouddha. Sa vie n'a point de tache. Son constant héroïsme égale sa conviction; et si la théorie qu'il préconise est fausse, les exemples personnels qu'il donne sont irréprochable. Il est le modèle achevé de toutes les vertus qu'il prêcha." An Anglican clergyman, Mr. Baring-Gould, bears witness that "the ethic code of Buddha can hardly be ranked lower than that of Christianity; and it is immeasurably superior to every heathen system that the world has ever seen." But most remarkable of all is the fact that Buddha is a canonized saint of the Christian Church. St. John of Damascus, in the eighth century, wrote a religious romance, of which the narrative is taken from the "Lalita Vistara," the story of Buddha's life. It became very popular in the Middle Ages, and the hero was canonized. He has his festal days in the Roman communion on 27th November, in the Eastern on 26th August, under the name of Josaphat, a corruption of Bodhisattva.

In all times and in all places men have lived pure and holy lives, and have shown themselves Christians, even "before Christ came in the flesh." Buddha, whose teaching approaches nearer than does that of any other founder of a religion to the teaching of Christ, has won, by the attractive beauty of his character, the unconscious homage of Christendom. He has been placed in the golden roll of Christian saints, side by side with St. Francis d'Asissi and other founders of religious orders, with St. Francis Xavier and other missionary heroes, and with Francis de Sales and other saintly men.—Pp. 168, 169.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1878. (London.)—1. The First Ten Years of the Canadian Dominion. 2. Mycenæ. 3. Victor Hugo. 4. A Woman's Reply to Frederick Harrison. 5. The North-west Frontier of India. 6. Constantinople. 7. The Proposed New University in Manchester. 8. The Duke of Argyll and Disestablishment in Scotland. 9. The Russian and Turkish War. 10. Phases of the Eastern Question.

In the literary department we find the following fine notice of CHARLES SUMNER:—

This installment of the life of a very remarkable man deserves to be widely welcomed. Although it was the lot of Sumner—as it is of all men of his aggressive stamp—to excite hostility in certain quarters, there can be no question either of his personal talents or his political prescience. The key-note of his character was struck when, in his Bowdoin prize essay of 1833, he quoted from Milton this passage: "For surely to every good and peaceable citizen it must in nature needs be a hateful thing to be a displeaser and molester of thousands. But when God commands to take the trumpet, and blow a dolorous or a jarring blast, it lies not in man's will what he shall say or what he shall conceal." Sumner was a man of strong convictions, and of an equally strong will in making these convictions known. He had great ambition, and was born to wield power of some kind or other. Intellectual force discovered the final outlet for his irrepressible volitions. He early became conversant with the greatest English writers. After graduating at Harvard College, he entered the Law School at Cambridge, where he speedily attracted the attention of the Judge, then Professor, Story. Writing to an old college school-fellow, after his choice of a profession, Sumner said, "If I am a lawyer, I wish to be one who can dwell upon the vast heaps of law matter as the temple in which the majesty of right has taken its abode; who will aim beyond the mere letter, at the spirit, the broad spirit of the law; and who will bring to his aid a liberal and cultivated mind. Is not this an honest ambition? If not, reprove me for it. A lawyer is one of the best or the worst of men, according as he shapes his course. He may breed strife, and he may settle dissensions of years." In the year 1838 Mr. Sumner, then a young and distinguished barrister, made a tour through Europe. He obtained an *entrée* into the best circles of English society, and became the personal friend of many of the greatest men of the time. That which it was not possible to achieve by an unknown native of this country was immediately conceded to Mr. Sumner, as it was about the same time also to Mr. Ticknor, another American who became the associate of many of our literary and political celebrites. This has always been matter of astonishment; and Mr. Hayward and others have testified that although Sumner's powers of conversation were not great, and it was difficult to name the qualities which would account for his success, his popularity was yet manifest and undoubted. Although not famous as a legal advocate, Mr. Sumner obtained considerable distinction as a writer for "The Jurist" and "The North American Review," and also as a lecturer before the Cambridge Law School, in the absence of the legitimate professors. When he returned to the States, however, in 1840, after his tour in Europe, he resumed his professional practice in Boston, and devoted his leisure hours to literary pursuits. In 1842 he began to let it be known that he had very pronounced views upon slavery, a subject to which he had given much thought for many years, as his father had before him. As witnessed in the case of numberless other great reforms and revo-

lutions, the ideas of Sumner and his associates upon the question of slavery were at first tolerated, then ridiculed, and at length feared. Whatever else might be said of Sumner, he was, at least, always in earnest, and terribly so on this subject of slavery, as his opponents at last discovered. On Independence Day, 1845, this prominent American statesman may be said to have inaugurated his political career. He delivered an oration at Boston upon "The True Grandeur of Nations," in which he uttered the words: "In our age there can be no peace that is not honorable; there can be no war that is not dishonorable." The oration, from its freedom and force of language, acted like a bomb-shell upon some portions of the assembly, and great dissatisfaction on account of it was afterward expressed with Sumner. Notwithstanding this, however, as all through his career, he was determined not to mince matters, but to hold forth and enforce the plain unvarnished truth. He took his stand with the reformers, who were as warm in their friendship as his foes became envenomed in their hostility. The remainder of his political career, and that by far the most important section of it, still remains to be dealt with. Readers will find Mr. Sumner's reminiscences of English society very entertaining. He was every-where received with favor, and voluntarily elected into the best clubs. He was present in the House of Lords when her Majesty delivered her first speech in Parliament, and thus wrote to a friend after that memorable event: "You well know I had no disposition to admire the Queen, or any thing that proceeds from her; but her reading has conquered my judgment. I was astonished and delighted. Her voice was sweet, and finely modulated, and she pronounced every word finely and distinctly, with a just regard to its meaning. I think I have never heard any thing better read in my life than her speech, and I could but respond to Lord Fitzwilliam's remark to me when the ceremony was over, "How beautifully she performs!" Hearing Carlyle lecture in the year 1838, Sumner wrote: "I heard Carlyle lecture the other day; he seemed like an inspired boy; truths and thoughts that made one move on the benches came from his apparently unconscious mind, couched in the most grotesque style, and yet condensed to a degree of intensity, if I may so write." Of Lord Lyndhurst, whom he heard in a debate in the House of Lords in the same year, 1838, he observes: "All my prejudices are against him; he is unprincipled as a politician and as a man; and his legal reputation has sunk very much by the reversal of his judgment in the case of Small *vs.* Attwood, in which it is said Brougham exerted himself with superhuman energy. Notwithstanding all this, Lyndhurst charmed me like a siren. His manner is simple, clear, and direct, enchaining the attention of all: we have nobody like him." Mr. Sumner's judgments upon Englishmen will not always be indorsed by readers in this country; but there is unquestionably much freshness in the manner in which they are expressed, and also in the anecdotes scattered about these volumes. The youthful judgments and de-

cisions of men, even upon their own affairs, are frequently totally reversed by themselves in after life. This was the case with Sumner. Being in Washington during the first session of the twenty-third Congress, he thus wrote to his father, after listening to the debates: "Calhoun has given notice to-day that he will speak to-morrow on Mr. Webster's Bank Bill. I shall probably hear him, and he will be the last man I shall ever hear speak in Washington. I probably shall never come here again. I have little or no desire to come again in any capacity. Nothing that I have seen of politics has made me look upon them with any feeling other than loathing. The more I see of them the more I love law, which I feel will give me an honorable livelihood." Yet the writer lived to be one of the greatest ornaments of that world of politics which so strangely affected him in earlier years. There is something in Sumner's character which approaches much in Mr. Gladstone's. Both are distinguished for an unswerving honesty of purpose, and a deep and lasting hatred of injustice and oppression. Mr. Pierce's volumes have been already widely welcomed, and the welcome is no more than they deserved. We shall await the completion of the task here commenced with great interest. That which remains to be done, however, is much more difficult than that which has already been accomplished.—Pp. 549–552.

## *German Reviews.*

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by Dr. Hilgenfeld. Second Number. 1878.—1. PÜNYER, The Speeches of Jesus in Regard to his Second Advent. 2. HOLTZMANN, The Development of the Idea of Religion in the School of Hegel. 3 HILGENFELD, The Basilides of Hippolytus. 4. EGLI, On Genesis vi, 1–4. 5. GÖRRES, Critical Researches on the Apocalyptic Martyr Antipas of Pergamos.

Third Number.—1. HILGENFELD, Hegesippus and the Acts of the Apostles. 2. GEBHARDT, The Ascensio Isaiae. 3. HOLTZMANN, The Development of the Idea of Religion in the School of Hegel, (Second Article.)

Every one who has any acquaintance with the history of German theology knows what lasting influence has been exerted upon its development in the nineteenth century by the philosophical system of Hegel. With other distinguished philosophers, Hegel shared the peculiarity that his profound philosophical theories were understood by only a few. Immediately after the death of the master a quarrel arose, therefore, among his followers: some, the so-called right wing, believing in the possibility of demonstrating the complete harmony between the new philosophy of the absolute and orthodox Christianity; while the other, or left wing—also called the Young Hegelians

—assumed a very hostile attitude, not only toward historical Christianity, but even toward the idea of religion. For among those who proceeded from the Young Hegelians were D. F. Strauss, the author of the "Life of Jesus," in which the biblical account of the life of Jesus was declared to be a myth, and L. Feuerbach, who rejected religion itself as a dream, and an illusion from which, when man awakes, he finds only himself. The article of Professor Holtzmann traces the history of Hegelianism in German theology in sketching the views of its principal representatives, from Philip Marheinicke, whom the right wing of the Hegelians proclaimed after the death of Hegel as his legitimate successor, down to Biedermann, who is characterized as one of the foremost Hegelian theologians of the present age. Among the men whose share in the development of Hegelian theology is treated of at length, are Marheinecke, Vattke, Arnold Ruge, Julius Froebel, Ludwig Noack, J. F. Reiff, Eduard Zeller, D. F. Strauss, C. G. Reuschle, H. Lang, A. E. Biedermann, and others. In the theological faculties of Germany the Hegelian school is to-day but feebly represented, and the son of Hegel himself is one of the most zealous chiefs of the orthodox evangelical party in the Prussian State Church.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) March, 1878.—1. BERSIER, The Testimony of the Apostles. 2. E. W., Alfred de Musset. 3. MASSEBIEAU, Justin Martyr, his Life and his Doctrines. 4. NYEGAARD, St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh.

April, 1878.—1. BOEGNER, The Theology of the Old Testament. 2. CADÈNE, Emilio Castelar. 3. DE RICHEMOND, Margaret of Orleans, Sister of Francis I., Queen of Navarre, Henry d'Albert, King of Navarre, and their Chaplain, Gérard Roussel, at La Rochelle. 4. DE RICHEMOND, Madame de la Fite, Reader of Queen Charlotte, and Governess of the Princess of England, 1737–1797.

Emilio Castelar is well known throughout the civilized world as one of the representative men of the Latin race. The newspapers of all countries have reproduced many of the great speeches made by him in the Spanish Cortes, and his brilliant, though brief and unsuccessful, career as President of the Spanish Republic, has secured him forever a front place among the promoters of free republican institutions in modern

Europe. A revised and enlarged edition of his work on "The Religious Art and Nature in Italy," which has recently appeared, has called forth this article by Cadène, which chiefly treats of the religious views of Castelar. Like all the republican leaders in the Latin countries of Europe, Castelar has shown himself a determined opponent of Ultramontanism and the Papacy. On the other hand, he shares by no means the sovereign contempt which so many political Liberals of Europe show for religion in general. On the contrary, he readily recognizes the legitimacy, the power, the frequently decisive influence, which religion has exerted upon the destinies of nations. He regards a religious faith as absolutely necessary; and in a powerful discourse which he made two years ago in Paris he emphatically asserted that the Latin race must assume another religion than Roman Catholicism or perish. What appears to him especially repugnant in Romanism is its political element, which he regards as the revival under another name of the despotic genius of ancient Rome. He is willing to accept a Church evangelically organized, without an earthly crown, without a human ambition, the friend of the nations, the patron of their rights, the consolation and hope of the oppressed—a Church as pictured by Gioberti. He abhors the Jesuits, but extols beyond measure the Franciscans of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries for having said, "Blessed be the poor." His own views on Christianity are somewhat indefinite. He seems to place great men like Galileo, Columbus, Guttenberg, Socrates, and Moses, on a level with Christ as redeemers of mankind. Still, he is an earnest opponent of materialism and fatalism. He believes in God and his providence, in the immortality of the soul and man's responsibility, all of which are for him fundamental and immovable principles of religious belief.

In its summary of current events the *Revue* calls attention to a new movement in favor of Protestantism. France has a number of politicians and literary men who, like Emilio Castelar, have arrived at the conviction that a longer connection with Ultramontanism would ruin the Latin race, but that Ultramontanism can only be supplanted by another religion. The editors of the *Revue Philosophique*, Bouchard and Renouvier, announce that they will henceforth publish a quarterly

supplement to their journal, entitled *La Critique Religieuse*, which will be specially devoted to the elaboration of the idea that France needs another religion than Roman Catholicism, and that it can find this religion only in Protestantism. "Nothing remains," says the prospectus of this supplement, "but Christianity, under the form both ancient and new, both traditional and free, of the Reformed Churches, which can again become what violence alone prevented them from being in the sixteenth century, and achieve the peaceable conquest of Europe. If we wish it, Protestantism can at once grow strong with us by the adhesion of the heads of families who, finding no longer the satisfaction of religious sentiments in the Church of the Syllabus, and, moreover, finding themselves bound by patriotic duty to break publicly with this Church, can yet not make up their minds to live isolated in their religious belief, nor to rely on the efficacy of pure negations for the change of the moral habits of a nation. Unfortunately, it is not paradox to maintain that Protestantism is not known in our country. The elementary truths to which we have called attention are generally so little felt that one might believe in a fixed plan to favor Catholicism by the maintenance of all the prejudices which cause it to exist. The persecutions to which Protestants have been subjected since the end of the last century, and the infamy or horror of which does not sufficiently touch us, have left the Reformation among us in such a humble and inferior condition that it appears to be merely tolerated. Every active and popular propaganda, every serious anti-catholic action, is denied to it. On the other hand, all facilities are offered to the clerical propaganda. It is popery which is the great distributer of temporal favors. Finally, the leaders of the oligarchic party, which are obeyed by only too large a portion of the dominant classes, have made of this privileged religion a kind of central fortress, to defend all abuses and all the social injustice which they find profitable. To labor for a true understanding of Protestantism, and thereby for its extension in our country, would serve the interests of civilization in general, and powerfully aid in the progress of the nations of Latin, Cesarian, and Papist traditions. Thus the Catholic organization, which has now definitively become what it has always endeavored to be, theocratic, would find itself in favor

of a war more dangerous than that now carried on against it every day by the press and individual protests." The same views are expressed by a Catholic writer, E. Réveillaud, in a pamphlet recently published under the title "The Religious Question and the Protestant Solution." (*La Question Religieuse et la Solution Protestante.* Paris, 1878.) The author calls on the Catholics who are convinced of the necessity of breaking with Rome to unite, and to organize a propaganda by sending able speakers to the most enlightened centers of France. These speakers are to convoke the liberal citizens, to lecture to them on the present state of society, and to ask them for immediate adhesion *en masse.* Then the Protestant authorities are to be called upon to furnish the new religious communities with pastors. The *Revue Chretienne* recommends the pamphlet for its religious earnestness, though it is not sanguine in its expectations as to the prospects of the plan proposed.

## ART. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE new Pope, Leo XIII., finds, at the beginning of his pontificate, the extensive religious connection of which he is the head in a very dangerous condition. The actual defections which have followed the Old Catholic movement may not yet attain a formidable number; indeed, the numerical relation of the Roman Catholic Church to other religious denominations has only to some extent been affected by it in Switzerland; but the attempt to force millions of merely nominal and indifferent Catholics into some kind of submission to the new pretensions of the hierarchy has awakened an opposition much stronger than was anticipated by the leaders of the Ultramontane party. In our summary of French reviews in the present number some reference is made to this manifestation of anti-Roman sentiments on the part of Spanish and French Catholics. We add to this an account of similar movements in Italy and Portugal. An interesting history of the reformatory movements which have taken place in the course of the present century in the Roman Catholic Church of Italy has recently been published in the fourth volume of the "Italia," a German periodical exclusively devoted to Italian affairs, and published by Karl Hildebrand. The following facts have been taken from it:—

A peculiarity of the Italians in regard to religious matters is the remarkable predominance of absolute indifference. In the parliamentary

proceedings of May, 1875, deputy Minervini expressed this opinion: "We have in Italy no religious question at all. From my friend, the Freethinker Macchi, down to Toscanelli, the chief representative of Catholic orthodoxy, I do not know a man who takes a warm interest in this question." The ministers of that year strongly indorsed this opinion. Minghetti, the Prime Minister, remarked: "If I study the history of Italy, I find the fact recorded on every page that our people have never become enthusiastic for religious affairs. From the times of ancient Rome down to the present day one seeks in vain in Italy for what has been called the religious passion." Minghetti's assertion that even the Italian Inquisition showed no trace of religious passion encountered an earnest contradiction, but the Minister of Public Instruction, Bonghi, one of the greatest scholars of Italy, declared, in concurrence with Minghetti's view: "We have no faith; the mere demand to believe makes faith for us impossible. The victory against Rome will not be obtained by any faith, but merely by the progressive development of reason, which shirks from no problem, from no question, from no difficulty, until it either overcomes them, or reaches the limits of its power." The great applause which was called forth by remarks like these confirms the view quite common among the best writers of Italy, that the Italians, as a nation, are destitute of religious feelings. Nearly four hundred years ago, when Martin Luther visited the Eternal City as a devout Catholic, he was frightened at the horrible impiety of the Italians. Macchiavelli, who gloried in this impiety, said: "We Italians are indebted to the Holy See for having made us indifferentists or atheists." A similar opinion on the influence which the Papacy has exerted upon the religion of Italy is expressed by Massimo d' Azeglio, one of the greatest statesmen and noblest characters of modern Italy: "Italy," he says, "is the old land of doubt. The Reformation gained little influence in Italy, not because the Inquisition annihilated it, but because Italy cared little for Rome, and less for Wittenberg. The priests of Rome have always shown by their deeds that they did not believe much; the doubt, the scorn, the sarcasm of Voltaire have always been more to their taste. The sight of Rome has stifled religion in Italy. And if it be true—as in my opinion it cannot be doubted—that a nation without faith cannot be strong and cannot be governed, it follows that Italy will never become a nation until it shall have formed a solid religious basis. Without this basis we shall always remain what we are now, a people of little strength, of a still weaker character, and of no ability to assimilate its primitive elements."

Notwithstanding this general tendency toward indifferentism, the number of those who believe in a religious reformation appears to be increasing. In the Parliament of 1875, which has already been referred to, the deputy, Tommasi Crudeli, made a distinction between the Roman Court and the Catholic Church, and claimed for the latter the right to see its desire for truth and freedom fulfilled. From a similar point of view, Guerrieri Gonzaga, now the foremost champion of the cause of Old Catholicism in Italy, assailed the Italian Government for giving to

Cavour's celebrated maxim: "A free Church in a free State," an entirely perverse application. Instead of regulating the normal relations between Church and State, Italy, he said, had made a law for proving to the world that the Pope, though deprived of his temporal power, was freer in Italy than any other country of the world. The maxim should no longer read "Free Church in a free State," but "Free Pope in a free State." Villari, the recent biographer of Savonarola, says: "Let us not be blind to the power and the influence of the priests. The public needs a religion; and because we never tell it a word on the religion which it needs, because it distrusts our rationalism, our skepticism, therefore it listens to the voice of the priests and trusts their guidance. It is our readiness to doubt which strengthens the power of the clergy. If we do not succeed in supporting the faith, and in feeding the true religious wants of the people, then may happen what I should regard as the most threatening prospect of the future: with our indifferentism and unbelief we shall only create a nation of Voltaireans and Ultramontanes." The remarks of Villari called forth several protests. Bonghi replied to him by the sarcastic question, "In what, then, does Signor Villari believe?" and another deputy asserted: "We happen to be children of the Renaissance and not of the Reformation; therefore all appeals for a religious change must die out unheeded." The fact, nevertheless, is well established, that at no time since the Reformation of the sixteenth century has there been so much thought, written, spoken, and planned on religious subjects in Italy as to-day.

The character of the hierarchy is so conspicuously political rather than religious, and the efforts of the Roman Court are manifestly so much more directed toward the preservation of its power than toward promoting Christian piety and a religious life, that many of those Italians who yearned for a religious renovation came to look upon the temporal power and the political connections of the Papal See as the only obstacle to the cause of religious reform, and upon a disconnection of the Church from politics as the surest road to a religious reformation of the Church. Such ideas were entertained by the two great national poets, Alessandro Manzoni and Silvio Pellico; the philosophers Rosmini and Gioberti; and the statesman Mamiani. Gioberti, whose name is so prominently connected with the establishment of the national unity of Italy, left a work, *Riforma Cattolica*, which was published after his death by Massari, and which proceeds from the maxim of Savonarola, "The Church needs a renovation." In chapter one hundred and fifty-nine of this work Gioberti says: "Thus far attempts have been made to reform Rome without Rome, or even against Rome. But it is rather necessary to reform Rome through Rome." And then the idealistic priest proceeds to enumerate a number of claims in regard to Church discipline which he advises Rome to abandon. The province of religious doctrines is not touched by him at all. Count Terenzio Mamiani in 1862 published a book, *La Rinascenza Cattolica*, in which he developed his views on religious reform. In 1871, when the temporal power of the

Pope had virtually come to an end, Mamiani wrote in a letter: "The reformatory movement in Italy is not intended to turn Protestant, or to establish a Church similar to the Anglican. It is, on the contrary, a Catholic reaction against Romanism, which has so long prevailed in the Latin Church and corrupted it. In the meanwhile, the antipapal reform has become exceedingly difficult since the latest dogmatic decisions, for it has now become necessary to deny the ecumenical character of the Vatican Council, and, instead, to revive the grand and salutary ideas of the Council of Constance, which reassigned to the Pope the position held by him in the most flourishing era of the Christian Church, that of the first among equals. But, unfortunately, there is reason to fear that all this may be too late. Romanism has finally achieved three deplorable results in Italy: superstition among the lower classes of people, indifferentism among the others, and unbelief among the majority of literary men and thinkers. After all, the greatest obstruction that had to be removed if the Catholic reform was to be made possible was the temporal power of the Pope; and a merciful Providence has caused us to be eye-witnesses of this great event."

In 1861 a learned priest of the city of Rome, Monsignore Liverani, apostolical protonotary, member of two congregations, and occupant of several other ecclesiastical titles and dignitaries, published a book under the title, *Il Papato, l'Impero e il Regno d'Italia*, (The Papacy, the Empire, and the Kingdom of Italy,) which caused a profound sensation in the Catholic world. With an unreserved openness the writer laid bare the evil consequences of the temporal power and the misgovernment from which Rome was suffering. He did not hesitate to assert publicly in this work—what, indeed, was an open secret in the city of Rome at that time—that under the secretaryship of Antonelli the States of the Church had become a prey to a rapacious family, and that Antonelli and his brothers had, with the aid of the Roman bank, converted the entire administration into a commercial and exchange company, which might be designated by the expression, official fraud. In a second section Liverani described with equal boldness the present condition of the Holy College of the Roman prelates, of the clergy in general, and of the Jesuits. Finally, he proposes a solution of the question of the temporal power, which, he thinks, might be satisfactory to the State and Church. He demands the re-establishment of the holy German Empire, not that of the German nation, which had perished in endless quarrels, but the Roman Empire of the Guidos, Lamberts, Arduins, and Berengars. The Italian Parliament should request the Pope to transfer upon the King of Italy the title and the rights of a Roman Emperor, and thus to solve the Roman question. Thus the king would receive his political power from the Pope in accordance with the strictest Vaticanism, and, moreover, in regard to the patrimony of St. Peter, only as a delegate. The real fullness of power would remain in the hands of the Church, and the king would be only the mandatory and representative of the Church. But, ingenious as the plan might look, it was laughed at by the Italian Gov-

ernment and Parliament, and was not sufficiently Roman to obtain the consent of the Papal Court. The author was given up to the violent attacks of a fanatical press, of which Father Curci at one time said that it had monopolized papal infallibility for itself. Liverani had to act on the defensive, and held out until November, 1878, when the *Unita Cattolica* announced that the author had asked and received the Pope's pardon for his liberal whims. He had returned from Florence to Rome in order to meditate on the past in a monastery of the Passionists. Ironically, the *Unita Cattolica* added: "Liverani had the merit to have explained and defended the precious relics which are in possession of the *Basilica Liberiana*, namely, stones of the cradle and crib of Bethlehem, of the swaddling clothes of the Saviour, and the six boards of the cradle which bears an ancient name, *Cunabulum Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. Now, the *Bambino Gesu*, at the approach of his holy birthday, has conferred, through his representative upon earth, the favor upon Liverani of recalling him."

Almost simultaneously with Liverani, the celebrated Neapolitan Jesuit, Passaglia, began his literary controversy with the Papal Court. He wrote in the Latin language a pamphlet, "For the Cause of Italy to the Catholic Bishops, by a Catholic." On account of the great reputation of the author, who up to that time had been regarded as one of the foremost theologians of the Church of Rome, the pamphlet caused a sensation hardly inferior to that produced by Liverani's book, though its contents were by no means equally interesting. Passaglia bases his right to speak on the subject of the temporal power, first, upon the general priesthood of every Christian; after that, however, he lays stress on the fact of his priestly consecration, since in his eyes the special priesthood of the Church stands as high above the general priesthood of believers as heaven is above the earth. In eloquent language he describes how one name is re-echoed and eliciting the thanks of the nation from one end of Italy to the other—Victor Emanuel; while only the dignitaries of the Church stand sulkily aside, and the Vatican is hurling its anathemas against him. Why should the quarrel be perpetuated? Why should not the hand be offered for reconciliation? The wrong of Victor Emanuel was not proved; opinions on the subject were divided, and no more than a "probability" of right or wrong could be asserted. The oath which Pius IX. had taken to preserve the patrimony of St. Peter was not binding, since a higher honor of God would be obtained by a union with those who had proclaimed the noble maxim, "A free Church in a free State." Passaglia's work was at once put on the Index; the excitement about his book soon died out. Ere long the penitent Jesuit recalled all he had said, and his name, once famous, gradually sank into utter oblivion. Quite recently the attempt to reconcile the Government of Italy with the Church by concessions on the part of the latter has been renewed by another distinguished Jesuit, Father Curci. Like Passaglia, Curci had risen to great eminence among the Jesuits. He had been one of the founders and one of the chief editors of the *Civita Cattolica*, the

Roman organ of the Jesuits, which, as such, was quite generally looked upon by the Ultramontane party throughout the world as being at the head of the Catholic press, and as the truest and most reliable expounder of the real sentiments of the Holy Father in Rome. It is certainly remarkable that among the most fanatical advocates of the ultra-papal theories sudden changes of opinion occur frequently. Curci had become alarmed at the future of the Italian Church, and had for some years sought consolation in compiling a popular commentary to the four Gospels. In the preface to the first volume he set forth at length his views on the situation of the Church, and the importance of a reconciliation between the Pope and the King of Italy. As Curci had long been on the most friendly terms with the Pope, he submitted the *exposé* of his views to him, in the hope of producing some influence, but the Pope disapproved and rejected them. The public knew comparatively little about the matter until in February and March, 1877, the *Rivista Europea* published the document in full, without the knowledge of its author. Curci maintains that in all human probability the temporal power, in its former condition and under the former circumstances, is absolutely gone; that it is folly to sit waiting for its miraculous restoration, and still worse folly to tell the people that the Church teaches that such a miracle will certainly be wrought; that there is very little fear of any foreign power interfering to restore the temporal power by force of arms; that the interests of the Church and the religious welfare of the people are suffering steadily increasing injury as long as this policy of diversion is continued, and that it is the duty of the Church in the meantime to accept the condition under which God has seen fit to place her; to use all and every advantage that condition presents, and wait his good time for that restoration when, if ever, it may seem good in his eyes to make it. In the meantime he argues that the best way to regain the power is to accept a *modus vivendi* with Italy which would not necessarily require a renunciation on the Pope's part of his temporal claims; to take part in the political business of the country, and fight the Church's battle on the floor of the Italian Parliament. These views, it will be seen, are quite moderate, if compared with those of Passaglia and Liverani; they nevertheless gave great offense to the Ultramontane party, and led to the separation of Curci from the Order of the Jesuits. After seven months of estrangement, Curci has, however, addressed, on April 29th, 1878, a letter to Pope Leo XIII., in which he declares his unreserved concurrence in what the pontiffs, and in particular Leo XIII., in his encyclical, teach concerning the temporal power, withdrawing whatever the Pope "may consider deserving of censure," and placing himself completely in the Pope's hands, most ready to follow always and in all things the Pope's teaching.

Simultaneously with the pamphlet of Passaglia two periodicals were established in Italy which were to serve as special organs of the friends of a religious reformation. One was called *l'Esaminatore*, the other

*l'Emancipatore Cattolico*. The former, which appeared in Florence, as its cautious title indicated, wished only to examine what seemed to require a reform, and its contributors generally wrote under the cover of anonymity. The hope was throughout expressed that the Papal See might be induced to introduce the necessary reform. In 1865 the *Esaminatore* published an extensive programme, which contained the following points: 1. That the laity have the right of electing their clergymen, and that they obtain a share in the administration of the secular affairs of the Church. 2. That the clergy and the people have the right of electing the bishops, under reserve of the rights of the crown. 3. That the bishops and archbishops be restored to their ancient diocesan and governmental rights, and that their servile dependency of Rome, and their oath of allegiance to the Roman Pope be abolished. 4. That the celibacy of priests be left to the free decision of individual priests. 5. That the free circulation of the holy Scriptures among the laity be permitted. 6. That the liturgy be read in a language understood by the people. 7. That auricular confession cease to be obligatory, and that communion under both species be restored. The party of the *Esaminatore* has not obtained a great influence. It desired to remain within the Church even after the Vatican Council, and disapproved of the course which the Old Catholic movement took in Germany and Switzerland.

Of much greater importance is the history of the *Emancipatore Cattolico* of Naples. It is the organ of a society which calls itself the *Società Nazionale Emancipatrice e di Mutuo Soccorso del Sacerdozio Italiano*. This society was founded in November, 1862, by the Dominican monk, Luigi Prota-Giurleo, in the Convent of St. Domenico Maggiore, in Naples, and four other monks of the same convent. The Government of the new kingdom of Italy expected from this movement a valuable aid in its conflict with the Pope, and gave it a vigorous support. In less than two years the society, which soon constituted itself as the Italian Catholic National Church, counted thousands of members. It is claimed that no less than three thousand five hundred clergymen of all degrees, including even four bishops, had joined it, and two cardinals were its patrons; that the number of lay members was more than twice this number, and that among them there were thirty-two deputies, sixteen senators, four ministers, eighty-six magistrates, three generals, fifty officers, etc. Twenty-two branch associations were organized in different parts of Italy. When Rattazzi became Prime Minister he transferred to the society four churches in the city of Naples for divine service. The leaders of this movement were sanguine in their hope for a complete success, when a political change in 1865 arrested its further progress. Ricasoli became Prime Minister, and in view of the threatening complication in Europe considered a reconciliation, or at least a compromise, with Rome as desirable. Active negotiations were carried on in 1865 and 1868 for filling a number of episcopal sees. The Government allowed the bishops who had been exiled or left their sees to return, and recognized them by giving the exequatur. Ricasoli took from the society in Naples the four

churches which had been transferred to it, and the bishops were not interfered with when they adopted the harshest measures against all the priests who had been in any way connected with the Emancipation Society. Some of the priests who were deposed applied for aid to the Government and Parliament; when it became known that these appeals were useless, a large number of priests publicly recanted. For the poorer among those priests who remained faithful to their convictions, an "asylum for deposed priests" was founded at Naples. Thus the number of clerical adherents to the Italian Catholic National Church was greatly reduced; but in 1873 there were still the names of five hundred and four priests attached to the petitions to the Italian Parliament in behalf of a recognition by the State of the Italian Catholic National Church. At the election of the first bishop of the Church about four thousand votes were cast. The bishop elect, Panelli, was consecrated by an Oriental bishop, but in 1875 was found to be unfit for his position. The second bishop, Canon Stanislao Trabucco, died shortly after his election. On January 6, 1876, the founder and leader of the entire movement, Luige Prota-Giurleo, was elected bishop, ten thousand two hundred and fifty votes being cast, of which Prota-Giurleo received eight thousand six hundred and twenty-nine. The cities chiefly represented in the election were Rome, with 392 votes; Naples, with 83 votes; Salerno, with 876; Torrento, with 596; Nocero, with 722; Trani, with 904; Messina, with 130; Syracuse, with 68; and Barletta, which in 1866 became so notorious by the persecution of Protestantism, with 943. The bishop elect himself has stated that two hundred and forty priests remained faithful to the movement, and some of them still are in the most influential positions of the Church. The bishop says that he has friends who take care of the interests of the movement in the consistory of the archbishop of Naples, as well as in the Vatican itself. The bishop elect has as yet been unable to obtain the Episcopal consecration. The National Catholic Church of Italy regards only the decrees of the first seven ecumenical councils as binding for the entire Church. The councils held after the separation of the Eastern Churches are not considered as ecumenical, and to their decrees an obligatory character is therefore not ascribed. An article in the last number of the *Emancipatore* for 1877, which gives a review of the National Church during the year, explains the delay in the consecration of the bishop by the complication attending the Eastern war. "But we are satisfied," it says, "with the significant increase in the number of our adherents, especially among the high dignitaries of the Church, and the laity of the southern provinces, especially in Calabria, Apulia, Basilicata, and Salerno." The relations with the representatives of the Old Catholic movement in Germany, Switzerland, and France are said to have become very cordial and intimate, and proofs of fraternal sympathy to have been received from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

## ART. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### FRANCE.

E. DE PRESSENSÉ has recently published the two discourses held by him on the occasion of the fifteenth synod of the independent evangelical Churches of France, which took place in November, 1877, at Lyons. The former treats of Christian Individualism and the Reformation, and the latter of Christian Individualism and the Crisis of French Protestantism. (*La Question Ecclesiastique in* 1877. Paris, 1878.) The author gives a very full review of the crisis in which the Reformed Church of France finds herself since 1877, and his book may at the same time be regarded as a reply of the free evangelical Churches which have repudiated the connection with the State to the discourse by which, about a year ago, E. Bersier, formerly a distinguished pastor of the free Churches, undertook to justify his entrance into the established Reformed Church.

### ITALY.

Since 1873 the Protestant Churches of Italy have been represented among the scientific journals of Protestant theology by an able monthly, the *Rivista Cristiana*, which was established in 1873 at Florence. It is edited by three professors of the Waldensian Theological Seminary in that city, and counts among its contributors representatives of nearly all the Protestant communions which have been established in Italy since the introduction of religious toleration, as well as other friends of Italian Protestantism. We notice in the list of contributors the names of the Rev. Mr. Gay, a missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the recently deceased Perfetti, (a Liberal Catholic,) the Frenchman Jules Bonnet, the Englishman Hemans, and the Germans Dr. Benrath, Elze, and Roennecke. The two latter are pastors of German congregations in Venice and Florence; while Dr. Benrath, a young professor of theology at one of the German universities, is author of a number of excellent works on Italian Protestantism, some of which have been mentioned in former numbers of the "Methodist Quarterly Review." The scope of the *Rivista* embraces all departments of Protestant theology, and the editors show a thorough acquaintance with the progress of theological science all over the world. Of special value for the Protestant world at large are the numerous articles relating to the history of the Reformation in Italy. As many Italian archives are only now becoming accessible to Protestants through the liberality of the National Government of Italy, the *Rivista* finds an abundance of excellent material for historical articles. Of the three editors, it is especially Comba who devotes himself to this subject. He has published valuable articles on the Reformation in Venice, having been enabled to use, for the first time, the minutes of the Inquisition, which are preserved in the Venetian *Archivio di Frari*, and other valuable documents. A valuable

article by Pons on the exegetical worker Antonio Bruccioli, is likewise based on the archives of the Venetian Inquisition. The German pastor in Venice, Elze, has contributed an interesting article on "Luther Before the Diet of Worms, according to the Letters and Reports of the Venetian Deputies." Each number of the *Rivista* contains also a summary of current ecclesiastical events.

## ART. XII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*History of Opinions on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution.* By EDWARD BEECHER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 334. 1878.

WITH a rather exclusive self-identification with New England Calvinism, the writer of this book unites a fair share of the eccentricity of a Beecher. Years ago he dissented from "orthodox" views by adopting Origen's doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, and in the present volume he favors Origen's doctrine of restoration. Without any sympathy with his leaning in this direction, we recognize his candor and conscientious spirit, we approve his plea for a restoration of the ancient spirit of mutual tolerance of opinions in the evangelical section of the Church, and have been not a little interested in the historical views he unfolds.

He first traces the history of the opinions on retribution in the Old Testament times, then in the period intermediate between the Old Testament and the New, and is then prepared for his investigation of the state of opinions in the early Church. Among religious thinkers before the publication of the New Testament there was the same variety of view as exists now. Philo and the Ascension of Isaiah taught annihilation of the wicked; the Sybilline Oracles, restoration; the Book of Enoch and the Book of Esdras, eternal misery.

In the early Church he gives the following as, in his view, the "real state of facts:"—"What, then, was the state of facts as to the leading theological schools of the Christian world in the age of Origen, and some centuries after? It was, in brief, this: There were at least six theological schools in the Church at large. Of these six schools, one, and only one, was decidedly and earnestly in favor of the doctrine of future eternal punishment. One was in favor of the annihilation of the wicked. Two were in favor of the doctrine of universal restoration on the principles of Origen,

and two in favor of universal restoration on the principles of Theodore of Mopsuestia."

The restorationism of Origen, he affirms, was not attacked until A. D. 376, when Epiphanius assailed his doctrine of the restoration of the devil, though not his doctrine of the restoration of all men. It was not until A. D. 544 that the restoration of all men was condemned, and then by a local and not a general council, and that by the arbitrary mandate of the Emperor Justinian. Thus Restorationism, we are told, was no heresy until the sixth century.

Between the two specialties Restorationism can, we think, boast a broader diffusion, but Annihilationism the earlier antiquity.

1. Of the apostolic fathers not one uses language that can be construed into Restorationism. Constable claims that they all express Annihilationism, and it is true that their expressions may be easily and naturally so construed. It is also true that most of them can be construed as according with the doctrine of eternal infliction. It often depends on the definition we give to certain terms which of the meanings we shall find. But not one of them utters an expression that can be construed into Restorationism. The earliest avowal of that doctrine comes from Origen. 2. Justin Martyr, who preceded Origen, and lived in Palestine, as Dr. B. fully admits and maintains, was an Annihilationist. 3. Dr. B. also fully admits that Irenæus, the great head of the St. John school of theology in Asia Minor, the contemporary of Origen, was an Annihilationist. Between St. John and Irenæus was Polycarp, the acquaintance and friend of both. Dr. B. admits that, if we could find Annihilationism in Polycarp, it would be a strong "case" of connecting that doctrine with the apostle. And what does he find in Polycarp? The find is certainly remarkable. Short and undoctrinal as Polycarp's epistle is, it contains three passages in which, Dr. B. says, "a holy life seems to be made the condition of the resurrection from the dead." But then there is a third passage which, he thinks, reverses this view. That passage reads thus: "He shall come to be the Judge of the quick and the dead, and his [Christ's] blood God shall require of them that believe not on him." But surely that passage affirms no resurrection of the wicked. The most ultra Annihilationists, the Second Adventists of the present day, fully believe that, at the coming of Christ, the wicked dead will be judged without a resurrection, and condemned as unworthy to be raised to eternal life. Dr. B. is, therefore, defenseless against their connecting Annihilationism with St. John through Polycarp. Without accepting either, we

think no fair controversialist should deny that "conditional immortality" makes the more respectable showing of the two in the earliest post-apostolic Christian age.

---

*A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-west, Chicago, Ill. 8vo. pp. 283. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George-st. 1877. Special edition imported by Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong, New York. Price, $3.

This fine volume comes to us from Illinois by the way of Scotland. Though coming from a publishing house usually issuing works for scholars alone, this is addressed to the general reader. With such purpose, it is written in a fresh, free, popular style, giving results rather than processes, and unburdened with untranslated quotations and learned references. It is divided into Three Parts. The First Part, after some introductory matter, has four excellent chapters on the canon, the integrity of its text, its historic credibility, and its scientific accuracy. Part Second brings us proofs of the inspiration. The proofs are drawn from the unique character, the diversity in unity, the organic completeness, the universality, the beneficent effects, the prophetic character, and the self-testimony of the Scriptures. Part Third furnishes important definitions, various theories of inspiration, and conclusions as to its true nature and extent. The author's views of inspiration are firm and high. A cheaper American edition with a broad circulation would exert a healthful effect on the public mind.

---

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*Modern Philosophy from Descartes to Schopenhauer and Hartmann.* By FRANCIS BOWEN. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Every one is at liberty to choose his own subject, but, as long as there is a convention in language, one should not feel at liberty to choose a misleading title. Professor Bowen, therefore, has the fullest right to publish a series of essays upon such philosophical systems as he finds interesting; but the title "Modern Philosophy" is much too large for the product. There is no mention of the Scotch philosophy, of the modern English philosophy, of the realistic philosophers of Germany, or of the leading living thinkers in Germany. If Professor Bowen chose to limit himself to German philosophy, there are certainly many systems more worthy of mention than some which he has expounded at great length.

Herbart, Trendelenburg, Ulrici, and Lotze are not noticed; and, instead, a hundred pages are devoted to Schopenhauer and Hartmann, who, so far as philosophy is concerned, hardly deserve mention at all. Schopenhauer's philosophy consists of the doctrine that the will is the thing in itself, and of a vast amount of abuse of every body else. The abuse is probably his own, but the doctrine of will as the basal element of being was published by Schelling in 1812, seven years before Schopenhauer's work appeared. The later form of Schelling's philosophy, which contains most of what is valuable in Schopenhauer, is not even noticed by Professor Bowen. Neither Schopenhauer nor Hartmann have any significance for thought. They have, indeed, railed mightily at the world, which they have done nothing to improve, and at humanity, which they have done nothing to honor. Besides, many editions of their works have been sold, and they have become popular with the newspaper philosophers and the disaffected classes. And this is not strange, for fashion determines the opinions of all would-be philosophers, and with many it is equal to a liberal education to be able to rail and scowl. But we expect the historian of philosophy to reverse all such judgments of conceited incapacity. Tupper may be widely read, but he does not, on that account, become a classic. The dime-novelist deserves no more consideration in philosophy than in literature.

A much more important question, however, is, How has the work been done? As English histories of philosophy go, the work is fairly done; but we cannot raise it high. It is not as good as it should be, and we are justified in expecting something better from Professor Bowen's life of leisure and study. The expositions lack point both in thought and statement. The critical points of the systems are not placed in a clear light: for example, the key of Leibnitz's system lies in the notion of substance. It was at this point that Leibnitz broke with Descartes and Spinoza, and here he made his chief contribution to philosophy. But one would get little idea of either the profundity or importance of his speculations on this point from Professor Bowen's exposition. Again: Leibnitz held the doctrine of latent mental modifications to be of the utmost importance in understanding mental phenomena; but Professor Bowen, though mentioning the doctrine, fails to give it the emphasis which it had in Leibnitz's system. His doctrine of volition and determinism is not mentioned at all. In short, we believe it possible to give a much more vivid and characteristic account of Leibnitz in the same space. In Descartes' system the

first question is, How does the *cogito, ergo sum*, become a fruitful principle? Professor Bowen does not give a clear statement of this point? The next difficulty is: If the existence of God is known by assuming the truth of consciousness, and the truth of consciousness is proved by reference to the divine veracity, has not Descartes reasoned in a circle? This fundamental question is not noticed. The essay on Spinoza is so general as to give only the commonplace information of any of the manuals. Whether Spinoza regards the Absolute as the cause or ground of the universe; whether the development of the Infinite is dynamic and successive, or whether it is only logical, and, hence, not in time—these questions are untouched, although great names are on both sides. The failure of Spinoza's monism, like that of the Eleatics, to account for the phenomenal world, is not noticed. His anthropology, which contains some of the most interesting parts of Spinoza's philosophy, is omitted. The essays on Fichte and Schelling give us no hint of the later form of their philosophies, and not a very clear account of their earlier views. The universal or transcendental ego, with which Fichte starts, finds its warrant in Kant; but Professor Bowen leaves its origin unnoticed. The primacy of the practical reason in Kant's system is the key to Fichte's views; but nothing is made of it in Professor Bowen's exposition. The essay on Hegel must be regarded as a failure. *Being equals thought*, is Hegel's fundamental equation; but what does he mean? Does he mean that any fancy of my mind becomes thereby a thing? or does he mean that every true thought of a thing is the thing itself ideally considered, and that the thing is only the realized thought? All being must have law and content, and, so far as it exists for us, that law and content must be rational. The irrational—that is, that which contradicts the fundamental laws of thought—cannot exist. Now, there are many who hold that Hegel meant this and nothing more. Again: Did Hegel teach a logical or a successive development of the Absolute? This is the question on which the schools split. We have no doubt ourselves that Hegel, in his "Logic," meant to describe a logical and not a temporal development of the idea. That these questions cannot be easily answered is, no doubt, true—the existence of the right and left wings prove that—but certainly no critic is justified in ignoring them. Moreover, if we admit the rule that a man is not gratuitously to be made out a fool or a knave, there can be little doubt of Hegel's own mind on these points. There is paralogism enough in Hegel's application of his theory to

details, and it could not be otherwise; but the underlying thought, that the laws of reason are also the laws of reality, is the necessary postulate of both religion and objective science. For compact statement, painstaking scholarship, and relevant criticism, the work in hand is not to be compared with the better class of German histories of philosophy. It retains the diffuseness of the lecture-room, and gives no information about the original writings, to say nothing of verifiable quotations. Its value, then, is not for the student, but for the general reader, or for one who is cramming for a loose, general examination. Without doubt, however, the general reader would find the work very useful in giving an outline of many philosophical systems which are not dealt with in most English works. We will only add that, to our taste, the author now and then protests too much. Rhetorical shudders are nowhere more out of place than in a history of philosophy. B.

---

*Political Science;* or, The State Theoretically and Practically Considered. By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, lately President of Yale College. 2 vols., pp. 585, 626. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1878.

Our English literature has been so barren of late years in works on political science, that we are prepared to welcome any respectable treatise on the subject. But this work of Dr. Woolsey's is almost a matter of pride, as it certainly goes far to redeem us from the reproach of sterility in this most important field. The work falls into three main divisions, as follows: "Doctrine of Rights as the Foundation of a Just State," "Theory of the State," and "Practical Politics." Part I treats of the general and particular rights of the person, and of society, with their sources and limitations. Part II expounds the theory of the State, and compares and criticises the various views upon this subject. Part III comprises about two thirds of the entire work, and will probably be found the most satisfactory part of it. Here the author reviews the earliest forms of government, and their development into monarchies, aristocracies, democracies, and confederations. Our own national system is analyzed at length, and compared with those of other countries. Here, also, the author discusses the function of the State as regards taxation, education, industries, etc.; and also its relations to order, public safety, morality, and religion. With the author's general conclusions we are in entire accord; and we do not hesitate to say, that no other work in the English language covers so wide a field, and that no other author has treated these subjects more fairly and impartially, or with greater knowledge and good-sense.

Passing to specific criticism, we are least satisfied with the author's discussion of the theory and foundation of rights. For ourselves, we hold that rights must be based either on power or on ethics; and that there is no middle way. The former conception, in whatever form held, reduces us to Hobbes' doctrine of the war of all against all as the natural state of man, which is terminated and made wrong only by enactment. This results in a complete subversion of the notion of rights; for these are nothing when they are not sacred and obligatory in themselves. We can escape this result only by making morals the foundation of rights, as follows: The development of the moral personality is the unconditional duty of every human being. It is, therefore, the duty of every other with regard to him to observe the conditions of his development so far as they are consistent with similar duties to other beings who co-exist with him. Hence, the acts and omissions on the part of B, which the right development of A demands, constitute A's rights with reference to B, and B's duties with reference to A. On this ground we can give a reason for the sacredness of rights. Man has duties, a moral task, to perform; hence he has inalienable rights. Separate the thought of moral duties, and there is no reason, except prudence, why men should not be enslaved as well as cattle. But man was not made for solitude. He can attain to his true self only in society. Hence, there is a foundation in human nature for the State, and thus the State has rights. It has no rights in itself, as if the empty form were of any account; but it has rights, as being necessary to the right development of the person. Hence, also, the State exists for the person, and not conversely. Theoretically, then, the State has a moral foundation and a moral significance. It does not exist to keep a herd of cattle browsing *quietly together*, but to furnish the conditions of the development of moral beings. As such, it may rightly undertake any measures, of whatever sort, which promise moral advantage to the individual. We believe that neither reason nor conscience will tolerate any other theory of rights and of the State than this. But, while Dr. Woolsey's views are in general agreement with these principles, it seems to us that he has not made the ethical foundation of rights and of the State sufficiently clear, but has at times almost ignored it. This we hold to be the chief defect of the work.

But, after laying down the theoretical relation of the State to the individual and to morality, while it is quite clear how much the State may do, it is not clear how much it is well for the State to do. This is entirely a question of experience, and not of

*a priori* determination. Formally, the State may do whatever will be for the general, and especially for the moral, development of the members of society; but this does not give us any insight into the best division of labor between the person and the State. Here the author shows great good-sense in refusing to side with the *doctrinaires* of either side. No general rule can be laid down which will hold for all cases. In certain states of social development many forms of governmental action may be expedient which would be inexpedient in other stages of progress. We quite agree with the author in justifying the theory of State religious establishments; and we equally agree with him in concluding that experience has shown that in modern society it is better for the State to leave religion to take care of itself. Mere speculation can determine nothing with regard either to the best form of a government or to the limits of governmental action. Most of our discussions of these topics are vitiated by the attempt to settle theoretically questions which are amenable only to experience. And so one party will have it that government is a matter of police; another party insists that government may rightly do any thing, and, therefore, it must attempt to do every thing. One will have it that the individual conscience should be free, and then he denounces all legislation against public immorality. Another recognizes that society has a moral root, and at once he jumps to the conclusion that it should regulate both morals and religion. Both of these extremes are well avoided by Dr. Woolsey. Taking the work as a whole, it is the best of its kind in our language.

---

*The Epoch of the Mammoth and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth.* By JAMES C. SOUTHALL, A.M., LL.D., Author of the "Recent Origin of Man." 12mo., pp. 430, with Illustrations. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1878.

The great work of Mr. Southall on the Recent Origin of Man, which has been amply noticed and summarized in our Quarterly, has made an unquestionable mark on the theories of man's geologic antiquity, so rife among scientists at the present day. Its immense masses of facts, gathered not only from scientific sources, but from the widest range of ancient and modern literature, have rolled down like an avalanche upon the pretended discoveries and dreamy theories which have reflected discredit upon an entire section of pseudo-scientific speculation with a very crushing effect. The present volume is an abridgment and popularization of that work, brought down in its survey of the argument to the present hour, and made more accessible to the general reader. At the

same time it is a brave advertisement from the author that after the lapse of time since his first publication he holds himself to be unanswered and has no retractions to make.

The work in its present form and popular style is worthy of a wide circulation. Several copies of it should be deposited in every library of our scientific institutions; especially in those institutions where there come from the professors themselves trenchant affirmations of the miocene man. Let the pupils know both sides of the question.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

***Adamites and Pre-Adamites.*** A Popular Discussion concerning the Remote Representations of the Human Species and their Relation to the Biblical Adam. By ALEXANDER WINCHELL, LL.D. (Originally published in the Northern Christian Advocate.) 12mo., pp. 540. Syracuse, N. Y.: John T. Roberts. 1878.

The appearance of Dr. Winchell's essays in the Northern Advocate evinces that the able editor is, "on sober second," or third, or fourth, "thought," not insensible that scientific discussions at great length, when they touch the biblical record, are worthy an ample place in a religious journal. Wisely, we think, he has spread these views before the people, not only for discussion, but to show that the believers in the Scriptures are not afraid of discussion.

The main point in these essays is the pre-Adamitism of the negro and other dark races. The learned author emphasizes the fact that the very word Adam contains the idea of *red;* that this may easily include the Mongol, with the Caucasian; but excludes the negro, who is *black.* To attribute the inferiority of these races to a process of degradation reverses in his estimation the "law of progress," which is elevation. Without any attempt to refute or even to dispute these positions, we will jot down some counter-considerations, which tend to preserve our belief in both the unity and Adamic origin of all our race.

1. If Adam means *red,* Ham, or, as it should be written, *Kham,* means *black;* and Egypt is called by the Psalmist the land of Kham; and the old Coptic name of Egypt was *Khemi.* Now, it is remarkable that, according to Moses, the posterity of this *black* patriarch streams *southward;* down into Africa; beyond the light of history; able in a few thousand years to fill a whole continent. It is held by some of the best scholars, Rawlinson included, that in the tenth chapter of Genesis most of the names of the descendants of the three sons of Noah were not per-

sonal, but tribal. They were, at any rate, names from which tribes, and races, and nations sprung. Now, several of the latest of these tribal names in the line of Kham cannot be positively assigned to any known tribes. They are apparently germ names, from which there sprung tribes who flung into more southerly Africa in the twilight and night of history. They are suggestive starting-points, indicating the stream of dark and ever darkening Adamites, spreading out beneath the rays of the African sun, from Suez to Good Hope.

2. Is it not reasonable to suppose, or can science deny, that the Adamic race was more plastic in its early days than now? There are some things in the Bible that imply this. The antediluvians lived centuries, at any rate those in the direct patriarchal line; and it was gradually that their lives dwindled down to our normal period. Paleontology is full of its displays of plasticity and variation in animal life. There was once an age of mammoths, and iguanodons, and other horrible things with horrible names. If we mistake not, species do seem to start up with strange suddenness and develop in forms, and rapidities, and magnitudes, at which ignorant science in all her pride stands aghast and dumbfounded. Species do start up with mighty vigor in the morning of life, and either dwindle by slow decay or go out at a leap. Certain it is that species have divergent capacities, some more some less. Indeed, we suspect that the true idea of a species is *a central form with a certain range of possible divergences.* And of every species, did we know the true limits of divergence, we might, perhaps, be able to draw a generic diagram. Now, is it at all unreasonable to suppose that the early Adamic race might have possessed a greater and more sudden divergent power than now; and that as it spread out from its first center into various climates and conditions, it might have early finished out its whole generic programme? If we are told that science has no experience of any such thing, and therefore "cannot know it;" we reply, that there is no experience by which science knows the contrary. She knows nothing about it; and must, therefore, hush into silence and let history speak. Our maxim is not: *The Bible is false unless science can affirm its statements.* Our maxim is: *The Bible is true unless science can incontrovertibly prove its statements false.* If this superiority of plasticity in the early Adamic race was real, we easily understand how the negro early appears on the monuments, and how the paleolithic man may have been both a son of Noah and an Eskim

3. We suspect that the Africans in Africa are an eminently plastic population. There are on that continent an immense variety of colors and characters, indicating an intense susceptibility to climatic influences. There appears to be a rapid physiological variability, and a tendency to abnormal specialties hardly belonging to the human species, except as a strange accident. There is a very great tendency to immense changes in language, especially where the alphabet is unknown. Fontaine has shown that two communities of American Indians once speaking the same language can by separation become unintelligible to each other in two centuries. It can be shown that African languages are still more variable; so that in two or three thousand years all traces of identity may be lost. In physical characteristics the African tribes shade off into each other. In short, the variations of the African populations from the Adamic original may be only a question of time; and the question of time is only a question of plasticity. Our impression is that a great extent of time might be a convenience, but is hardly a necessity.*

* Brace, in his "Races of the Old World," quotes from Dr. Yvan a description of certain Portuguese in the peninsula of Malacca, from which we give some extracts:—

"In the *space of half a century*, perhaps, religion, morals, tradition, written transmission of thought, are effaced from their remembrance. The most hideous idleness and absence of all wants are substituted for enjoyments acquired by labor. This degradation presents itself under its characteristic forms: stunted growth, physical ugliness, want of life among children, obtuse intelligence, perverted instincts, progressive successions of sickly transformations, reaching, as a final result, to the extreme limits of imbecility." This last degenerative form appears strikingly in the descriptions of Dr. Yvan, and we cite his own words. "There exists," says Dr. Y., "in the environs of Malacca, in the direction of Mount Ophir, a little hamlet situated in the midst of the jungles. The inhabitants of this hamlet are in a frightful state of destitution; they do not cultivate, they live outside of all social laws, having neither priest to marry them, nor cadi, nor judge, nor mayor, to regulate their differences. Their dwellings are a kind of cabins made of reeds covered with leaves of the palm-tree, and their only industry consists in going into the woods to search for the wax produced by wild bees, in washing sand, and in gathering the resin which runs down the trees.

"The three or four men that we found in the hamlet were lying down aside, smoking coarse maize cigarettes, and chewing the *siri* like the women. Every one was naked, or wore very little clothing. The complexion of the children was almost white; that of the men and women, soot color. They had thick lips, large black eyes, straight projecting nose, and rough long hair. They were all small and thin. One would have said that this population passed without transition from infancy to the decline of manhood; youth seemed not to exist for these unhappy people; their eyes were hollow and their skin withered.

"Our guides, who were Malays, addressed some of the women, asking them

4. The "law of progress" we hold to be alternative in its character. It may tend upward, or it may be downward, or it may be horizontal, according to conditions. Nations and races have their falls, as well as their rises. They rise and they fall either by slow ascent and decline, or by sudden success or catastrophe. Surely Dr. Winchell is familiar with instances that astonish us at the depth of degradation to which a community may descend, and astonish us still more at the suddenness with which the descent is made. And we doubt whether deeper degradations can be found among the tribes of Africa than among the tribes of Northern Asia, whom Dr. W. derives from Adam.

In the early ages whenever emigrations took place from the seats of civilization, the conditional law of progress worked rapidly downward. No vehicles could carry the machineries and conveniences of life, and the traveler went, or was driven, forth, in comparative nakedness. Scarcity begat quarrels, and the weaker party were driven farther into the wilder wilderness, already barbarized. In the struggle for life temper was rendered savage, knowledge was lost, body was degraded, and all recollection of the primitive period was erased. And yet, strange to say, remembrances of the Edenic origin and of the Noachic flood can be traced from Chaldea to Mexico!

On the whole, we do not yet quite accept the pre-Adamite.

---

*Caricature and other Comic Art in all Times and many Lands.* By JAMES PARTON. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877. 8vo., pp. 340.

Pictorial satire is one of the earliest and most universal forms of art, and its history presents a phase of human nature amusing to the popular thinker and suggestive to the philosopher. Both as-

how they named their village, where were their husbands, etc. But after hearing their replies, they declared to us that they could not comprehend perfectly what they said, on account of a great many words that were not Malayan. The priest who accompanied me descended from his horse, approached them, and discovered that the language they spoke was a simple mixture of Malay and Portuguese.

"This language itself was the most real expression of the sad mental state of these unhappy people. They knew neither who they were nor whence they came. The names by which they were called represented no family recollection, for they lived rather promiscuously. The idea of the time was above their weak conception, and most of them made themselves remarked by such brutishness that their visitors could obtain no reasonable reply even to the most simple questions."

If half a century can produce such a degradation, what can a thousand years accomplish?

pects of that phase are admirably presented in this volume. The abundance and the elegance of the illustrations, with their comic connections, are a perpetual amusement, and Mr. Parton's discussions are often in his best style, both piquant and reflective. The work begins with the remains of Roman caricature as exhumed at Pompeii. It traces the art, with ample and amusing specimens, in Greece, in Egypt, and in India. In Europe it follows the chronological line, religious and secular, from the Middle Ages, through the Reformation and the Puritan times. As the modern nations arise, the thread branches and becomes complex. Specially interesting is the chapter of caricature during our American Revolution. Of course, when we arrive at our own day, when Nast and his various competitors send out their multitude of displays, daily and weekly, history is swamped by the abundance of material.

Of all extant caricatures, there is one possessing a supreme interest for the historian and the Christian thinker. It is a most singularly accidental proof of the historical truth of Christianity, derived by unique means from an unexpected source. It is the caricature of a Christian at the close of the first century, worshiping a crucified ass. We give it here as presented in the volume.

"This picture was found in 1857 upon the wall of a narrow Roman street, which was closed up and shut out from the light of day about A. D. 100, to facilitate an extension of the imperial palace. The wall when uncovered was found scratched all over with rude caricature drawings in the style of the specimen given. This one immediately arrested attention, and the part of the wall on which it was drawn was carefully removed to the Collegio Romano, in the museum of which it may now be inspected. The Greek words scrawled upon the picture may be translated thus: 'Alexamenos is worshiping his God.'

"These words sufficiently indicate that the picture was aimed

at some member, to us unknown, of the despised sect of the Christians. It is the only allusion to Christianity which has yet been found upon the walls of the Italian cities; but it is extremely probable that the street artists found in the strange usages of the Christians a very frequent subject."—Pp. 25–6.

This is an incontestable proof that Christianity existed at Rome in the first century; that its founder was held to have been crucified; and that he was understood by Pagans to be worshiped by his followers as God.

---

*The Christian's Heritage, and other Sermons.* By the late MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS, D.D., LL.D., together with an unfinished Autobiography. Edited by his son-in-law, Rev. MATTHEW NEWKIRK. 12mo., pp. 361. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1878.

The autobiographical sketch of Dr. Jacobus is short and hardly satisfactory. Where our interest in a man's life depends chiefly upon the historic events in which he bore a part, the story is all the better from the fact that he who tells it saw with his own eyes the things which he describes. But where our interest centers in the man himself, how he began, how he grew, and what he became, some one else should tell the story. The autobiographer writes in perpetual dread of the possible charge of egotism and self-conceit, and so dares not tell all we want to know.

Dr. Jacobus was born in Newark, N. J., and made a profession of religion when about fourteen years of age, uniting with the Presbyterian Church. He was educated at Princeton, passing through the college and the Theological Seminary with great credit. When about twenty-four years old he was licensed to preach the Gospel, and the next year was settled as pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, N. Y. Here he remained eleven years, honored, useful, growing steadily in influence among his people, and also among his brethren in the Church generally. In 1852 he was elected to the Chair of Oriental and Biblical Literature, in the Western Theological Seminary, at Alleghany, Pa., where he spent the remainder of his life, about twenty-five years, during fourteen of which he was also pastor of a Church in Pittsburgh. He died very suddenly, "almost without seeing death or tasting its bitterness," in October, 1876, at the age of sixty years, leaving a name which will long remain "as ointment poured forth."

He was eminent as a preacher, and many who had been profited by his discourses desired to possess some of them in permanent form, hence this publication. The discourses selected are twenty

in number, the subjects being: "The Christian Heritage," "The Limitations of the Divine Working," "The Laws of the Divine Manifestation," "Modern Indifferentism," "Every Man his Own Builder," etc.

And they are sermons, models of clear, direct, and powerful appeal to saint and sinner, instructing, cheering, building up, urging the one to high attainments in the divine life, inviting and beseeching the other to come and secure an "uttermost salvation." There occur now and then some of the technical terms and phrases of the Geneva School of Theology. In fact, he always writes under the shadow of his creed; and in his strongest appeals to the unsaved there is a painful carefulness in the use of words, which shows that he was laboring hard to save his doctrines as well as to save the sinner. He opens the door widely, points to the rich banquet spread, and urges all to come in and eat and drink, without money or price; but there is a certain caution in the invitation, a true indication of mental reservation, and the preacher is all the while mindful of Calvinistic skeletons in the closet, even when he declares that "every man's eternal future shall be according to his own free choice."

---

*A Series of Lectures on Transubstantiation, and other Errors of the Papacy.* Delivered in St. Louis, Missouri. By E. M. MARVIN, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Second Edition. 12mo. St. Louis: Logan D. Dameron, Agent, Advocate Publishing House. 1878.

As it appears from a preface dated in 1860, a priest of the Romish Church delivered in St. Louis, in the Autumn of 1859, a series of lectures on the points in controversy between Catholics and Protestants. These lectures were reported in full in the columns of a city paper, and attracted considerable attention. The Rev. E. M. Marvin (afterward one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, lately deceased) was led to deliver in reply, on successive Sunday evenings, in the church of which he was then pastor, a series of discourses in defense of Protestant principles. The copyright is dated in 1878, and the book appears as a posthumous publication.

The published discourses are twenty-two in number. The topics discussed are those which have been long in controversy, such as, The Rule of Faith; Transubstantiation; Infallibility; The Primacy of Peter; Church Unity; The Doom of the Papacy; The Influence of Romanism in Religion and Civilization, etc. These subjects are handled fairly and in a good spirit, yet ably and vigorously. The author does not withhold the truth, however un-

welcome its utterance may be to his opponent; but he does not disgust an inquiring reader nor irritate his antagonist by sneers and needless insult. This is wise as well as Christian. There is an instinctive tendency to judge of doctrines, not wholly by the abstract arguments adduced in their support, but by the character which they seem to create, and the spirit which they foster.

Our author is master of his subject. His style is clear and forcible; his argumentation is candid, fair and conclusive; and if his modes of expression are now and then somewhat more animated and rhetorical than is usual in grave theological treatises, the reason is found in the fact that the work was not written for the professional student, but consists of discourses prepared for a popular audience. For such popular use they are admirably adapted. There is enough of solid reasoning, enough of historic and biblical learning, to amply sustain the positions taken, and yet so much of vivacity and the force of personal address as to make the book attractive to the general reader.

---

*Crowned Victors:* The Memoirs of over Four Hundred Methodist Preachers, including the First Two Hundred and Fifty who died on this Continent. Compiled by Rev. J. W. HEDGES. Introduction by Rev. A. E. WILSON, D.D. 8vo., pp. 630. Baltimore: Methodist Episcopal Book Depository. Rev. D. H. CARROLL, Agent. 1878.

This is a noble memorial volume, commemorative mainly of the departed worthies of the "Old Baltimore" Conference. The "two hundred and fifty" of the first generation includes, indeed, the entire body of the Conferences. The so-called "memoirs" appear to be simply the Conference obituaries, literally copied, preceded by the usual question, "Who have died?" and, after the manner of the time, rather brief characterizations than biographies.

But more than half the volume is devoted to the Baltimore Conference. Here, too, the "memoirs" appear to be a simple compilation from the Conference minutes. For a large share of the names this was sufficient; but there was a galaxy of brilliant men furnished to the Church by Baltimore, of whom the routine obituary hardly furnishes a sufficient record. Better justice should, at this day, have been done to John A. Collins, whose great parliamentary ability shone so splendidly at the General Conference of 1844. There was the quaint and versatile James Sewall, than whom no speaker we ever heard had greater power of transforming his audience with alternate wit and pathos, convulsing them with laughter while the tear was yet moist in the eye. "Brethren," said he at the close of a discourse, "I have

now preached you a good sermon; a first-rate sermon; the best sermon, I think, that I ever preached in my life. But it is none of mine; it is old Robert South's." To another Sewall, *young* Thomas Sewall, (he will, as our well-remembered pupil at college, be always *young* to our recollection,) a warmer and more fitting tribute is paid.

It is a handsome volume, creditable to the press that issues it, and worthy to be a monumental record to "Old Baltimore."

## *Educational.*

*The Principles of Rhetoric, and their Application.* By ADAMS S. HILL, Boylston, Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College. New York: Harper & Brothers.

*The Elements of Rhetoric.* By JAMES DE MILLE, M.A. New York: Harper & Brothers.

It was Goldsmith, we believe, who remarked of Kames' "Elements of Criticism," "It is easier to write such books than to read them." We incline to think that many readers since his day have entertained a similar opinion. Of treatises upon rhetoric there are more than enough; but they are, for the most part, very dull reading, even to the students who are supposed to need them. Upon most of them Butler's keen couplet—

> "All the rhetorician's rules
> But teach him how to name his tools"—

is still an apt criticism. A classified list of tropes, and of the varieties of style and kinds of composition, is not rhetoric. A scheme of the intellectual faculties, the emotions and desires, is not rhetoric. And yet one or the other of these things, or, some times, an odd mixture of both, forms the staple of most books upon the subject. Rhetoric is purely an art, not a science. It aims to state the laws of effective communication by language. Such laws are, indeed, based upon principles; but the investigation of these principles belongs, not to rhetoric, but to the sciences of psychology, esthetics, logic, and grammar.

It is the prime merit of Professor Hill's little manual, that its author has discovered clearly the limits of his subject, and has treated it in a simple and orderly manner, rigorously excluding all irrelevant discussion. Part First gives rules for purity, clearness, force, and elegance of diction; for the arrangement of words in the sentence, and of sentences in the paragraph. Part Second contains special directions for the management of narrative and

argumentative composition. All discussion of poetry as a distinct variety of composition is omitted, and very properly. The explanation of its forms belongs to grammar; the explanation of its principles to esthetics. The definitions and rules throughout are clear and terse, and are illustrated by an abundance of fresh and well-chosen examples, most of which are taken from recent writers. The book has evidently grown out of actual experience in the class-room, and many of its suggestions are unusually acute and practical.

Mr. De Mille's book, though more pretentious, is not so satisfactory. The author shows, at the outset, an uncertain grasp of his subject by the hesitating "twofold definition" which he gives to rhetoric: "The art of persuasion, and the art of ornamental composition"—whatever that may be. His book contains a considerable body of information; but it is ill-digested, and much of it is of little value. It is a book of definitions rather than of precepts. One hundred closely-printed pages are wasted upon the figures of speech. Antimetabole, synocoesis, hypocorisma, synathroismus, epanorthosis, and fourscore more equally useless terms, Mr. De Mille has laboriously dug up from the forgotten pages of the older rhetoricians. Such an array of barbarously named tropes we have not seen marshaled in any English book since the days of old Puttenham's "Art of Poesie." But, though abundant, Mr. De Mille's definitions are seldom brief or precise. Some are vacillating and indecisive, like that quoted above. Some are tautological, as, "Energy of style may be defined as strength of expression." Some are verbose, as, "A style which exhibits conciseness without meagerness, and which is forcible and axiomatic, is called terse." Some are ungrammatical in expression, as, "The faulty use of obsolete words is where they are really obscure, etc." Some are actually incorrect, for examples, frigidity is wrongly defined, (p. 224,) and the term harmony is constantly misused for melody. Examples of a slipshod mode of expression are altogether too frequent throughout the book. We suspect that the author has violated nearly all his own rules. Take as a single case the slovenly use of the pronouns in the following sentences: "English grammar requires far more attention than it ordinarily receives. It may not be so logical as that of the classical languages, and there may be not a few points about which professed grammarians differ; yet *it* may be affirmed that this very looseness and comparative lawlessness arises from the world-wide comprehensiveness which characterizes *it*, and *it* should

incite every writer to master whatever difficulties there may be." We should have little patience with such English as this in the essays of a college Junior. A similar carelessness shows itself in occasional misquotation; as in the examples from Milton's "Ode on the Nativity" on page 272, and from one of the most familiar verses of the New Testament on page 201.

Purged of such faults as these, Mr. De Mille's book would serve a good purpose as a rhetorical dictionary; but it is hardly suited to the uses of the class-room. W.

## *Literature and Fiction.*

*The Art of Beauty.* By Mrs. H. R. HAWEIS, Author of "Chaucer for Children." Illustrated by the Author. Large 12mo., pp. 398. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Great is the Diana of the fashionables. The author, by way of foundation, lays down the principle that the culture of beauty is a matter "of the first interest and importance," and is, therefore, the natural right of every woman.

There is, she argues, a joy in beauty of every kind, and a pain in ugliness; and the wise culture of this valuable art consists in discovering the things that are truly beautiful, and governing ourselves accordingly. She proceeds to show what dress and ornament mean, and what dress should be; discusses styles, ancient and modern, materials, and colors; condemns both corsets and shoes on esthetic as well as sanitary grounds; eulogizes sandals as the next best thing to going barefoot; defends jewelry; apologizes for the patches and hair powder of by-gone days; lays bare the mysteries of adapting the color of dresses to the complexion of the wearer, and closes with a panorama of illustrative contrasts, girls beautiful and homely, graceful and awkward, adepts in the art of beauty and novices therein. The book is written in graceful English, and is very readable. Almost any one, old or young, may learn something from it. Still, those will be best prepared to appreciate it who are not only impressed with the great importance of the subject discussed, but, like the ambitious youth who achieved the wonderful neck-tie, "give their whole minds to it."

## *Periodicals.*

*The Bishops' Address to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1878.

The Southern General Conference of 1878 forms, as we earnestly trust, a propitious epoch in the history of American Methodism. At its opening almost its entire general action was auspicated in the Address of the Bishops—a document which, by its ability and noble tone, gratified every magnanimous Northern as well as Southern reader. On the momentous questions of fraternity, negro education, and an ecumenical union of Methodism, it gave no uncertain sound, and ample was the response it received from the action of the Conference. Henceforth, and we trust forever, we are not divided on any great moral issue. We are, indeed, two independent denominations, having all the rights each of such a body; and yet ours is one theology, one original history, one set of institutions, one religious tone and temperament. Between us there are currents of sympathy not existing in the same power with any other body. We shake hands fraternally with all Christians; but, beyond all doubt, we shake hands with none in quite the same unity as with a brother Methodist.

The Conference authorized two new Conferences in the North, in the earnest and honest faith that there were Northern fields where the work could be most successfully performed by themselves. We doubt not that they will be cordially welcomed by their brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are sinners enough, and wickedness enough, in our North to render every help desirable. Let there not be war, but mutual sympathy and aid. And wherever we go into the South, it is to carry money, and churches, and schools, and colleges, in order that the waste places may be repaired, the standard of improvements be raised, prosperity—religious, civil, and economical—reconstructed, and peace and unity be conferred upon this our great nation. Blessed be the God of our fathers, that we are now enabled, by the removal of a great moral difference, to enter on our divine mission of PEACE!

We wish that we could deposit within the hearts of our Southern brethren the complete realization of the fact that we never hated them. We did hate that fatal institution which was, in truth, the common enemy of South and North. When they felt bound, as a "solid South," to enter upon its defense and maintenance, there arose first a moral issue, and then a bloody conflict.

We render earnest thanks to Almighty God that that baptism of fire and blood has past. The night is far spent, and the morning seems to dawn. Unless the ferocious spirit of our sectional political partisanships again lights the torch of civil war, that morning will culminate to a glorious noontide. We are ready to lay a wreath upon the tomb of the brave men who fell on both sides; not as approving the cause of the Southern side, but as declaring that both were brave, sincere, and brothers; and from the altars of both Churches we trust one volume of prayer will rise to the eternal throne that such fraternal blood may never again be shed.

Yet there are still shades of difference in the views of the two Churches and the two sections, which time alone can mitigate, and which we believe time is mitigating. With the assimilation of institutions the two sections will assimilate in character. The South will adopt the free school, immigration, and industrial enterprises. She will grow energetic, develop her wonderful resources, and become rich and populous. Such a nation will arise as never before existed. All this if peace, fraternity, and unity be preserved. In view of such a future, let our mutual criticisms—for mutual criticisms there still will be—lose something of their asperity, and take a more fraternal tone. There truly are times and objects, often, that require the boldest moral denunciation and anathema; when it is duty to hold up to abhorrence iniquity that refuses reform and repentance. Our fraternal declarations avow that no such requirements between us exist. And even of criticism there are two different kinds. There is a criticism which rejoices in making out and sustaining an accusation. It is even glad that the fault existed, that it may exult over the inferiority of its object. And there is a criticism which speaks only in order that a fault may be removed, and that rejoices in bringing about a beneficent change. It is often not difficult to decide to which of these two classes a given criticism belongs. Nor is it difficult to decide which of these two kinds ought to be used by the spokesmen of the two fraternal Methodisms. We Northern editors, of course, proudly think that we see a great many wrong things in the Church South; but there are a great many things to admire and love, and a great many inducements to wait with patience the sure march of progress; and there is even some slight reason to suspect that we ourselves are not as perfect as we might be. There are hearty advocates of fraternal union in both Churches, and they should understand each other,

and boldly speak and act in the cause of brotherhood and peace. As the great danger of the day is political sectionalism, so the great duty of the hour is the abolition of North and South as terms of partisanship. Our "Quarterly" belongs to neither the Republican nor Democratic party, but to the as yet invisible party of peace, brotherhood, and perpetual union.

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, herausgegeben von Prof. D. E. SCHURER. Leipzig.

The first number of this able theological review contains a careful critique of Dr. Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," by Prof. G. Plitt, of Erlangen. Professor Plitt concedes the great value and the urgent need of such a work as Dr. Schaff's title would call for; and he admits the many excellences of the actual book as we have it. But he makes the following adverse points: As a whole, the work is too plethoric in some parts and too meager in others. Besides, it is of too subjective or polemical character. The author demeans himself throughout as a sectary of the Reformed Church, whereas the only appropriate attitude would be that of the simple historian, treating his material in a purely objective manner. Many of Dr. Schaff's notes are irrelevant to the matter in hand; and the historical argument might well have been greatly abridged. What propriety was there in introducing a Life of Zuinglius and Calvin? His entire first volume might have been reduced to one half its actual compass without the least loss. The Confessions of the Lutheran Church are very imperfectly given. Five times as much space might justly have been given to Lutheranism. The book of Dr. Schaff is not, therefore, satisfactory. Its plan is but imperfectly carried out.

*Die Reformation in der Kölnischen Kirchenprovinz.* Von G. DROUVEN. Cöln: Schwann.

A history of the incipient reformation of the Roman Church of Cologne at the time of Archbishop Hermann, written by a Catholic priest. The book is remarkable, both from the fact that it freshly replaces before the public the beautiful image of one of the most gifted and highest dignitaries of the Roman Church, freely and frankly welcoming the purer light of the reformed religion so soon as it was presented to him, and then cheerfully sacrificing all his honors and emoluments rather than act against his awakened

conscience, and also from the fact that it is of Roman Catholic authorship. For surely it required rare courage, under the recent Ultramontane terrorism, for such an author to write such a book. Priest Drouven admits frankly the most excellent gifts of Archbishop Hermann, and concedes the sincerity of his endeavors to purify the Church and to abolish many abuses. He only regrets that the archbishop did not keep within such bounds as the papal hierarchy would approve, but that he went so far as to work the forfeiture of his office. This picture of a "reformed" archbishop is very significant.

---

*Johannes Damascenus.* Von F. H. GRUNDLEHNER. Pp. 266. Utrecht: Kemink und Zoon.

An interesting sketch of the life and opinions of this great Christian thinker of early Middle Ages. Grundlehner insists, against Landner and others, that Damascenus held a high political office at the court of the Mohammedan prince of Damascus.

---

## *Pamphlets.*

*Statistics of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.* By W. H. DE PUY, D.D. 20 pages, 8vo. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1878.

This pamphlet consists mainly of the admirable article by Dr. De Puy in our last Quarterly. It is a tract for the times, and as such attracted much attention. So much fancy talk has lately been uttered by the contemporary periodical press, both religious and secular, about "the decline of Methodism," that it was just the moment to put upon it the fatal extinguisher of statistical facts, and this has been done with relentless hand, as nobody else could do it, by Dr. De Puy.

So far as our observation can decide, this late breeze of bruited decline took its origin from the unguarded and extreme language of the "Independent." The burden of the "Independent" was the "failure" of Methodism; and this was stated so sweepingly and continuously, that our own mind was at the time impressed with it as coming from a hostile animus. Understanding this "failure" so charged to be a "failure" of Methodism in our cities in comparison with other denominations, Rev. Mr. Atkinson, of Chicago, furnished a most valuable article, showing that such "failure" did not exist. Later explanations of the editor, however, showed that he did not mean even this. What he did mean was a "failure" in Methodism to progress as fast in city as in coun-

try. And so, conversely, if Methodism had not progressed as fast in country as in city, either way there would have been a "failure;" so that we are furnished with a very nicely fitting pair of pantaloons. It was a "failure" in Methodism to beat herself. This reminds us of a series of alphabetic lines, which we learned in our boyhood, in which it was said that "R ran a race with himself and got beat."

Without one word of "arguing," this pamphlet is one powerful argument. It is an argument for outsiders and for insiders. It bids outsiders to understand that Methodism declines to "decline." It cautions our insiders to rise into sympathy with institutions which turn out such marvelous results, and to cherish a joyous conservatism. It is an argument for unity, loyalty, and persistence.

It is curious that with such an organization in our possession, so full of success and promise, a secular paper could lately, with truth, remark that in no Church was there so much discussion of forms of government as in ours. Of the most successful of all Protestant systems every self-conscious genius supposes he is a competent reconstructor. There are among us professional artisans whose main line of thought from General Conference to General Conference is to "mend the Discipline." They are not satisfied with a discussion of modifications during a few months before each General Conference, allowing an intermediate repose period. The Church must, through the whole quadrennium, hear the monotonous click of the tinker's hammer. No wonder the weary Church votes it a nuisance.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*School History of Rome.* From the Foundation of the City to the Extinction of the Empire of the West. Abridged from Dean Merivale's General History of Rome, with the Sanction of the Author. By C. PULLER, M.A. 12mo., pp. 390. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Shakspeare's History of King Henry the Fifth, Edited, with Notes.* By WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. 12mo., pp. 192. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Harper's Greek and Latin Texts. 18mo., New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.
*Platonis Dialogi VI. Ex. Recensione.* C. F. HERMANNI. Pp. 327.
*M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanorum Disputationum Ad. Brutum. Libri Quinque, Recognovit* REINHOLDUS KLOTZ. Pp. 189.

*The Expositor.* May, 1878. Edited by the Rev. Samuel Cox. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

*Church Extension Annual, including the Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church. For the year* 1877. 8vo., pp. 115. Church Extension Rooms, Philadelphia, Pa.

*The Elevation of a Race and the Redemption of a Continent.* An Address delivered before the American Colonization Society, January 15, 1878. By WILLIAM H. ALLEN, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 11. Washington Colonization Building. 1878.

*The Non-Denominational Gospel Mission to the Prisoners of the Tombs of New York.* By a Committee of Clergymen and Laymen. 8vo., pp. 20. New York: Printed for the Gospel Mission. 1877–78.

*Sermons on the Atonement and Baptism.* By Rev. THOS. J. BRYANT. 12mo., pp. 119. Printed by Geo. W. Cyrus, Camp Point, Ill. 1878.

*Is There a Hell?* An Inquiry and an Answer. By Rev. JOHN A. CASS, A.M. 16mo., pp. 31. Boston: D. Lathrop & Co. 1878.

*The Duty of Literary Men.* By T. A. GOODWIN, A.M. 12mo., pp. 16. New York: Burny & Co. 33 Park Row. 1878.

*History of the English People.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A. 8vo. Vols. I and II. Pp. 1076. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Modern Dwellings in Town and Country, Adapted to American Wants and Climate, with a Treatise on Furniture and Decoration.* By H. HUDSON HOLLY. With One Hundred Original Designs, comprising Cottages, Villas, and Mansions. 8vo., pp. 219. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Beauty for Ashes.* By ALEXANDER DICKSON. 12mo., pp. 436. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

*The Prayer-meeting and its Improvement.* By Rev. LEWIS O. THOMPSON. With an Introduction by Rev. A. E. Kittredge. 12mo., pp. 208. Chicago: W. J. Holmes. 1878.

*The School and the Family, The Ethics of School Relations.* By JOHN KENNEDY. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The King in His Beauty.* By Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. 12mo., pp. 347. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1878.

*The Old Looking-Glass; or, Mrs. Dorothy Cope's Recollections.* By MARIA LOUISA CHARLESWORTH. 12mo., pp. 269. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1887.

*The Doctrinal Integrity of Methodism.* By BISHOP E. M. MARVIN, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. 12mo., pp. 132. St. Louis: Logan D. Dameron, Agent, Advocate Publishing House. 1878.

*Cicero's Tusculan Disputations; also, Treatises on The Nature of the Gods, and on the Commonwealth.* Literally translated, chiefly by C. D. YONGE. 12mo., pp. 466. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1877.

*Stories from Homer.* By Rev. ALFRED J. CHURCH, M.A. 12mo., pp. 275. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Green Pastures and Piccadilly.* By WILLIAM BLACK. 8vo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*An Open Verdict.* By Miss M. E. BRADDON. 8vo., pp. 169. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Deceivers Ever.* By Mrs. H. LOVETT CAMERON. 8vo., pp. 116. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Less Black than We're Painted.* By JAMES PAYN. 8vo., pp. 139. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The History of a Crime.* By VICTOR HUGO. Translated by Miss FANNIE LETRIDGE in Collaboration with an English Translator. 8vo., pp. 79. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Esther Pennefather.* By ALICE PERRY. 8vo., pp. 175. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Justine's Lovers.* 8vo., pp. 135. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

Harper's Half-Hour Series. 32mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878:
*Da Capo.* By Miss THACKERAY. Pp. 119.
*Shepherds All and Maidens Fair.* By WALTER BESANT and JAMES RICE. Pp. 198.
*My Lady's Money.* By WILKIE COLLINS. Pp. 216.

Franklin Square Library. 4to. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878. Unbound.
*Is He Popenjoy?* By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Pp. 105.

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1878.


## ART. I.—MADAME DE STAËL'S "GERMANY."

THE authoress of the "Allemagne" is known to the reading public chiefly by her fictions, "Delphine" and "Corinne;" but with more critical readers her reputation rests mostly on works which, though now hardly known to "common readers," produced a sensation throughout Europe three quarters of a century ago. Her essay "On Literature considered in its Relations with Social Institutions," which Sir James Mackintosh pronounced "a great work, the first attempt, on a bold and extensive scale, to define the philosophy of literature;" her "Considerations on the French Revolution," which, for its broad and profound views of civil polity, if not for its style, is worthy of the pen of Burke, and of which Villemain said that it is incredible it should have proceeded from the pen of a woman; and, above all, her "Allemagne," which Mackintosh esteemed the "most elaborate and masculine production of the faculties of woman," are the best distinctions of her rank in the intellectual world.

Alison considered her "the first of female, and second to few male authors." Jeffrey, of the "Edinburgh Review," pronounced her "the greatest of French writers since the time of Voltaire and Rousseau." Byron, who met her often in London, where the "Allemagne" was first published, read it with admiration, notwithstanding his cynical opinions of women of literary pretensions. "What the —— shall I say about the

'Germany?'" he writes. "I like it prodigiously. I read her again and again." "She is the first of female writers of this, perhaps of any age," he remarks in a note to his "Bride of Abydos." He writes to Murray: "I do not like Madame de Staël, but, depend upon it, she beats all your natives hollow as an authoress, and I would not say this if I could help it.... She is a woman by herself, and has done more than all the rest of them together, intellectually; she ought to have been a man." Vinet, the greatest of modern Swiss thinkers, devotes a whole volume (in his "Course of French Literature") to her and Chateaubriand as the two literary representatives of their epoch; and from his high theological stand-point generously appreciates her moral influence on her age. Sainte-Beuve, the best of French critics, regards her as the representative woman of the times of the Revolution and first Empire, and, like Vinet, places her by the side of Chateaubriand, the two chiefs of French literature since the period of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau; but he admits that she was "richer in ideas than Chateaubriand." We hazard little in affirming that any one chapter of the didactic works of Madame de Staël (her treatises on the "Passions" and on "Literature," the "Germany," etc.) contains more original and profound ideas than can be gathered from all the writings of Chateaubriand. He was the superior painter, she the superior thinker. He was her only rival—"Under the Consulate and Empire rivals," says Sainte-Beuve, "but since accorded a common admiration." Chateaubriand's "Genius of Christianity" gave *éclat* to his name; but its importance arose principally from the coincidence of the book with a reaction of the national mind from the materialistic skepticism of the Revolution, a reaction which his book doubtless aided among a limited class, but which proceeded from antecedent causes, and was essentially a tendency of the political reaction of the period. This fortunate coincidence has rendered historical, perhaps immortal, a work, the false erudition and falser logic of which have been redeemed from critical contempt only by its surpassing rhetoric, and its art, never surpassed in the painting of natural scenes.* The *Genie du Christianism* has no longer any rank

* See Macaulay's rather too severe judgment on the *Genie*, in his Life by Trevelyan.

among Christian "apologetics." "It is," says Vinet, "too much for a simple poem, too little for an apology; the theologian and the painter mutually embarrass themselves in it; they exchange and confound their arguments." It was a plea for Christianism more than for Christianity. It aided Napoleon to restore the medieval ecclesiasticism of France, but did little for the national spiritualism, which alone can be enduring, and of which Madame de Staël was pre-eminently a representative writer. The historian, Lacretelle, who passed through all the stages of the Revolution, and was himself a representative in the academy and in literature of Christian spiritualism, says that "Madame de Staël, born in the midst of the philosophic circles of the times, but instructed by a father and a mother always faithful to their religious sentiments, and inclined, by the elevation of her soul, as well as the power of her genius, to spiritualism, was the first who made us comprehend the necessity of returning to this high philosophy." In every respect, except as a colorist, her rivalry with Chateaubriand (not to say her supremacy) may be asserted.

To all these critics the "Allemagne" was her culminating literary production. "It was," says Vinet, "an enterprise of reaction against a triple despotism, of a man in politics, a sect in philosophy, and a tradition in literature." "A book," says Lamartine, "through which she has poured, and, as it were, filtrated all the resources of her soul, of her imagination, of her religion."

The history of the "Allemagne" is extremely interesting. It was not a temporary book, to be rendered obsolete by time, as its title might seem to imply—no more so than the "Germania" of Tacitus. Every page is stamped with genius, and genius is essentially immortal. In our endeavor to trace its history we must claim the forbearance of the reader, for the task has never before been attempted, so far as we know. It will necessarily be somewhat discursive, as it must extend over much of the period of the long exile of the authoress. Its complete history would require us to accompany her in her travels in Germany, where she made her preliminary studies for it, especially at Weimar with Goëthe, Schiller, and Wieland; to restore the literary *coteries* of her *chateau* at Coppet,

on the shore of the Leman, where its pages were discussed by Sismondi, Schlegel, Barante, Bonstetten, Werner, and many other brilliant men, the best thinkers of the period; and, in fine, to reproduce much of the contemporary criticism and literary gossip, and of the correspondence that passed between Coppet, Weimar, the *salon* of Madame Recamier, of Paris, and that of the Countess of Albany (wife of Charles Edward, the British Pretender) in the Casa d'Alfieri at Florence, for these were then the intellectual centers, the literary courts, of Europe, and maintained intimate relations. A more attractive range of literary research could hardly be desired, but we are compelled to confine ourselves to some of its most salient points.

The "Allemagne" was a result, and also a further provocation, of that remarkable persecution with which Napoleon pursued its writer through her "ten years of exile," a persecution which has never had a complete parallel in literary history, and which at last afforded to the world one of the grandest examples on record of the triumph of the pen over the scepter and the sword. She had passed through all the stages of the Revolution, from its very inception. She abhorred its excesses, but never abandoned the essential principles of political reform, of popular liberty, which it promulgated, and which, in spite of its atrocities, have rendered it, in the estimation of impartial writers, the epoch of modern history; unless, indeed, we must assume as that epoch the great event which initiated it—the North American Revolution. Though she always insisted that she had no "animal courage," she had superlative moral courage, and faced bravely the worst horrors of the revolutionary terrorism to save her friends, and in some instances her enemies, from the guillotine. She was dragged through the jeering mobs of the streets of Paris to the tribunal of Robespierre, passed into the Hotel de Ville under an arch of pikes, was struck at on the stairs by one of the mob, and saved from death only by the sword of the *gendarme* who conducted her and averted the blow. She thus came near being the first female victim of the Revolution. On the next day the beautiful Princess de Lamballe became its first feminine sacrifice, amid bloody orgies, which history has hardly dared to record —hewed into pieces, one of her limbs shot from a cannon, and

her heart and head borne on the points of sabers through the streets in what has been called "an infernal march." Fleeing to her Swiss home at Coppet, Madame de Staël made her *chateau* an asylum for the proscribed. It was crowded with refugees for some years. No man or woman rescued a greater number of such sufferers. No one was more eminently the heroine of the Revolution than she, not excepting Madame Roland. But on coming out of its terrors she affirmed, down to her last hour, the genuine rights of the people, which it had so much abused. When almost every conspicuous character remaining in France had compromised with the usurpations of Napoleon, she was still loyal to liberty. When even her most intimate associates, political as well as literary—Benjamin Constant, Sismondi, Lacretelle, Barante, Chateaubriand—had fallen away, she and her friend Lafayette still stood erect for republicanism, and stood almost alone. Liberty, she wrote to General Moreau, must always be the noblest idea and force of great souls. We must never disparage it on account of its abuses; if we abandon it we give up the hope of the world.

She would not, because she could not consistently with the instincts of her superb genius and her generous heart, compromise with Napoleon. At first she shared the universal enthusiasm of France for the young conqueror of Italy. He professed entire loyalty to the republic. She hailed him as the restorer of order and the protector of freedom. But in conversations with him she detected, as by the intuition of her genius, his ulterior designs. He perceived that he was detected. He tried to win her. Through his brothers, Joseph and Lucien, he made her tempting offers. He proposed even to pay her the debt of the Government for two millions loaned by her father, an honest debt formally acknowledged by the Government, but which he afterward refused to pay, and which she recovered only after his downfall. It was a splendid opportunity for her and her sons; but she never wavered. She could not sacrifice her political principles, for with her they were moral convictions. She chose rather to wander, a proscribed exile, over Europe through all the years of the imperial reign. Napoleon came to fear this solitary woman of genius more than any royal antagonist on the Continent. He could appreciate her wonderful intellectual power, though on the

island of St. Helena he maliciously attempted to depreciate it; but even there he acknowledged to Las Cases that "she will last." For years he persisted in attempts to conciliate, that is to say, bribe her. His brother Joseph (her cordial friend) was repeatedly used for this purpose; the French prefects at Geneva, instructed by the Minister of Police, frequented Coppet to importune her to recognize him in her writings—to say something, "in the style of Corinne," for him, or for the infant king of Rome; she was assured it would end her exile and restore the fortunes of her family. She said nothing against him in her writings, (nothing directly hostile, at least,) but she would say nothing for him. To have favored him would have been, in her opinion, recreance not only to France, but to the human race.

But though she wrote nothing against him, the tacit opposition of such a character was an insufferable grievance to his egotism; and then she was the most eloquent talker in France, and her *salon*, at Coppet or in Paris, was a social and political center, where gathered not only all the higher elements of the opposition, but the best minds of Paris and the leading diplomatists of Europe. "No one enters her *salon*," said Napoleon, "who does not leave it my opponent." "Coppet is an arsenal furnishing arms against me to all Europe." He could hardly have paid her a higher compliment. She was, in fact, the oracle of the opposition; and her friend, Benjamin Constant, one of the most effective publicists of the day, was her representative in the Legislature. At her instance he delivered a speech against the monarchical designs of Napoleon. The evening before he whispered in her ear, "You see your *salon* crowded; if I speak to-morrow it will be deserted. Think again." "It is necessary to follow our convictions," was her only reply. On the next evening, which had been appointed for a special gathering, all her usual guests were absent. They sent apologies, and recoiled before the rising power of the First Consul. Fouché, the head of police, went to her and advised her to "retire into the country, and in a few days all would be appeased." "But on my return," she says, "I found it quite otherwise." She knew, however, that an invincible power remained in her otherwise feeble woman's hand—the pen. She resolved to vindicate by it her claims to social and

public recognition. In this time of desertion and of the worst chagrins that a woman can suffer, she composed her essay on "Literature." It produced an immediate and surprising impression. No woman had ever attempted so elaborate a literary work. "Its success," she says, "entirely restored my position in society; my *salon* was again filled." Without a word for or against Napoleon, it was a plea for liberty as the best basis of literature and all social ameliorations of the human race. It asserts the doctrine of the perfectibility of the race. "I adopt this doctrine," she says in her introduction, "with all my faculties. It is the conservative, the redeeming hope of the intellectual world." It was Vico's theory of the philosophy of history better applied; he applied it to monarchy, she to republicanism. Her social triumph was complete; her *salon* was again thronged by the best Parisian society, and the diplomatic representatives of Europe; even Napoleon's brothers, Joseph and Lucien, could not be kept away. Napoleon could never forgive her; she had struck at all his hidden designs. He waited and watched for his opportunity of revenge.

Necker, her father, not long afterward published his "Last Views of Politics and Finance." She was with him, at Coppet, at the time, and Napoleon falsely attributed it to her. Necker wished him to be a Washington for France. This would never do. He sent an order to him to let politics alone, and threatened his daughter with banishment.

She subsequently ventured furtively back toward the capital, and hired a house ten leagues from it. Her friends flocked to her. Napoleon was told that she was holding court there, and seized the occasion as a pretext for exiling her. She was informed that a *gendarme* would soon take charge of her and her children. He tortured her with delays. Unable to bear this painful suspense, she recalled, with hope, the image of a friend, the loveliest woman in soul as well as in person then in Europe, of whom the good Duke of Montmorency had said that he "loved her as an angel on earth,"—one whose transcendent beauty produced a sensation in the streets wherever she passed, converged upon her the gaze of public assemblies even when Napoleon himself was speaking, and was excelled only by the grace of her manners and the purity of

her heart—a woman who subdued the jealousy of women as well as the passion of men, "invincibly protected by the aureole of virtue which always surrounded her;" whose "presence anywhere was an event, and produced a tumult of admiration, of curiosity, of enthusiasm;" even the common people in public places calling upon her with shouts to rise, that they might pay their homage to beauty in her person; who, when it was known that she was to be a collector for a public charity at St. Roche, found it impossible to make her way, without assistance, through the throng that crowded the aisles, stood upon chairs, hung upon the pillars, mounted even the altars of the side chapels, and gave twenty thousand francs, more for the sight of her than for the sacred design of the occasion; who enchanted all men that beheld her, yet by her moral fascination compelled them to abandon lower hopes for her coveted esteem and her self-respectful friendship; who declined the proffered hearts of princes, and even the possibility of a throne, that she might maintain the obligations of a marriage of "convenience," made when she was but fifteen years old with a man who was forty-two; and who, when her opulent fortune was lost, and after the restoration had re-established the factitious distinctions of society, and even in old age and blindness, could still hold spellbound around her the *élite* society of Paris. "She was," says her niece and biographer, who knew her most intimate life, "devoted, sympathetic, indulgent, self-respectful. You found with her consolation, strength, balm for suffering, guidance in the great resolutions of life; she had a passion for goodness." She was, says another authority, "an incomparable being in all respects. Her charming qualities had something so peculiar that they can never be perfectly described. Only scattered traits of her supreme grace can be given." Napoleon himself was smitten by her charms, and, through Fouché, persecuted her with his importunities to induce her to become a lady of his court, ("*dame de palais,*") but she disliked the man, and declined the brilliant offer. He seized the first opportunity of involving her in the exile of Madame de Staël, compelling her to leave her family and the charmed circle of her innumerable Parisian friends, and wander obscurely in the southern provinces and Italy for years. It was a remarkable coincidence that in these

degenerate times two women, one the most beautiful, the other the most intellectual, in modern history should appear in the same country, and should be united in an inseparable sisterhood. Through all the remainder of Madame de Staël's life Madame Recamier was her most intimate feminine friend, and consoled her in her last hours.

She now found shelter under her friend's roof at Saint-Brice. But the *gendarme* reached her at last, bringing an order, signed by Napoleon, and requiring her to depart within twenty-four hours. After harassing trials she escaped to Germany, and thus did her great enemy open the way for the production of her greatest literary monument, the "Allemagne," the work which, by a striking coincidence, was to crown her fame in the very year in which the crown was to fall from his head. We are tempted to follow her in its preparatory studies there, but our limits forbid. She observed with the eyes, the insight, of genius every aspect of German life and literature. At Weimar she learned the German language, and astonished and perplexed Goethe and Schiller by her transcendent conversation, and her virile intellect, so strongly contrasted with the vivacity, the *abandon*, of her womanly heart, for the real problem of her character was the fact that in her were combined the intellect of man with the heart of woman. She remained three months in the little literary court of Weimar, and the grand duchess, Louise, became her life-long correspondent. She traveled over much of Germany, and studied well its higher life in the court of Berlin, where she was received with much distinction. An important event in her life was the friendship she formed in the Prussian capital with Augustus Schlegel, the greatest of living critics, who thenceforward was a member of her household down to the year of her death.

The death of Necker recalled her, heart-broken, to Coppet. Her health gave way. Proscribed in France, she sought relief in Italy, accompanied by her children, Schlegel, and, part of the time, by Sismondi. Genius alone knows the philosopher's stone that turns every thing to gold. Her travels in Italy produced "Corinne." On her return she ventured again clandestinely to within some leagues of Paris, to publish it. The prefect of the *Seine-Inferieur* was afterward dismissed for treating her with courtesy. But her intellect was again to

triumph. Suddenly there broke in upon her almost utter solitude the burst of enthusiasm with which Europe hailed the appearance of "Corinne." "It was one of the greatest events of the epoch," says Vinet. "It carried all suffrages," says the "Biographie Universelle." "There was but one voice, one cry of admiration in lettered Europe, at its appearance," says her cousin, Madame Necker de Saussure. Napoleon, whose egotism was as petulant as his ambition was great, was mortified by this success. The official journals attacked the book. Villemain says that Napoleon himself wrote the hostile criticism of the "Moniteur." But neither his scepter nor his pen could touch the indefeasible honors of her genius. She stood out before all Europe crowned, like her own "Corinne" on the capital of the world. But he could still annoy and oppress her, and he now resumed his persecutions of not only herself, but of her dearest friends, with incredible minuteness, cruelty, and perseverance. He renewed her exile. She went to Coppet, where a court of the best minds of Europe gathered about her; and then again to Germany, to resume her preparations for the "Allemagne;" to Weimar, to Berlin, to Vienna, accompanied by Schlegel, Sismondi, and Constant. Her progress was an ovation. But the Germans hardly knew what to think of her. With their views of woman, so different from those which Tacitus attributed to their ancestors, they were disposed at first to wonder at her, then to be equivocally sarcastic, but at last to both wonder and admire. They could never, however, entirely surmount their first opinion, that there must be something inadmissible in such high intellectual claims on the part of a woman, and she a French woman. Her books, indeed, surprised them, and her conversation fairly dazzled their slower wits; but she was so subtle, so oracular! The Pythia might belong to classic Greece, but could not come out of France.

The American scholar, George Ticknor, met at Berlin some thirty years later the old Prime-minister, Ancillon, who told him a characteristic anecdote of her visit to that city. He said:—

When she was here she excited a great sensation, and had the men of letters trotted up and down, as it were, before her successively, to see their faces. I was present when Fichte's turn came.

After talking a little while she said, "Now, Monsieur Fichte, will you be so kind as to give me, in fifteen minutes or so, a sort of idea, or *aperen*, of your system, so that I may know clearly what you mean by your *ich*, (I,) your *moi*, (me,) for I am entirely in the dark about it?" The notion of explaining in a little quarter of an hour, to a person in total darkness, a system which he had been all his lifetime in developing from a single principle within himself, and spinning, as it were, from his own bowels, till its web embraced the whole universe, was quite shocking to the philosopher's dignity. However, being much pressed, he began, in rather bad French, to do the best he could. But he had not gone on more than ten minutes before Madame de Staël, who had followed him with the greatest attention, interrupted him with a countenance full of eagerness and satisfaction: "Ah! it is sufficient—I comprehend—I comprehend you perfectly, Monsieur Fichte: your system is perfectly illustrated by a story in Baron Munchausen's travels." Fichte looked like a tragedy; the faces of the rest of the company like a *comedie larmoyante*. Madame de Staël heeded neither, but went on: "For, when he arrived once on the banks of a vast river, where there was neither bridge nor ferry, nor even a poor boat or raft, he was at first quite confounded, quite in despair, until, at last, his wits coming to his assistance, he took a good hold of his own sleeve, and jumped himself over to the other side. Now, Monsieur Fitche, this, I take it, is just what you have done with your *ich*, your *moi*, is it not?" There was so much truth in this, and so much *esprit*, that, of course, the effect was irresistible on all but poor Fichte himself. As for him, he never forgave Madame de Staël, who certainly, however, had no malicious purpose of offending him, and who, in fact, praised him and his *ich* most abundantly in her *De l'Allemagne*.

In June, 1808, she was again at Coppet, working on "Allemagne." Baron von Vogt, a man of intellect, was there assisting her by his conversations; Sismondi was there, preparing the fifth volume of his *Italian Republics;* Schlegel was there, busy in the preparation of his Lectures on "Dramatic Art" for publication at Heidelberg; Constant was there, preparing his "Wallenstein" for the press. Matthieu de Montmorency spent some time at the *chateau*, where no man was more welcome. Etienne Dumont, the associate of Mirabeau, (some of whose best speeches he composed,) afterward the friend and editor of Jeremy Bentham, was there, casually at least. Madame Recamier cheered her friend by frequent letters, and by the promise of a visit and of her company in another journey to Vienna. Letters passed often between Weimar and Coppet; the Duchess Louise, esteemed, since the

battle of Jena, with Napoleon's own acknowledgment, as one of the great characters of the times, kept up her correspondence with the authoress, and the marble bust of the latter, by Tieck, was honored with a place in the palace of Weimar. The *Allemagne* was under incessant discussion in the conversations and correspondence of the *chateau*. Three years (1808, 1809, and 1810) were devoted to its composition, six years in all to its preparation. Sismondi, writing to the Countess of Albany, (September 6, 1809,) says: "She has completed about a quarter of the work; but that which is written appears to me superior to any thing that we have yet had from her pen. It is not like 'Corinne,' the frame of a romance in which observations on national character are presented; she treats directly her subject, and handles it with a force that no one would expect in a woman. There is a truly admirable depth in its judgments of national traits, in its intellectual pictures, etc." "Nothing so new, so impartial, and so penetrating has yet been written, I think, on the character of any nation. This, doubtless, will be her best work," wrote Baron von Vogt to Madame Recamier.

When it was completed she again entered France to publish it, but kept at the prescribed distance of forty leagues from the capital. She obtained the necessary authorization of the censorship after the elimination of a few sentences, and of the eloquent concluding chapters on Enthusiasm. Her preference of Goethe's "Iphigenia" over that of Racine had to be qualified, and, among other suppressions, was that of a passage in which she described Germany, deprived of liberty, as a temple which fails of columns and roof. When it was printed, Napoleon changed his mind; the French had conquered Germany, but he was not mentioned in the book. The ten thousand printed copies were cut into pieces, and converted into pasteboard. She was ordered to leave France immediately. A hint was given her, by the Minister of Police, of imprisonment in Vincennes, where the Duc d'Enghien had been murdered by her persecutor. "Ah, my God!" she wrote to Madame Recamier, "I am the Orestes of Exile, and fate pursues me!" She was in despair, but was inflexible. The police demanded her manuscript; they wished to destroy the book utterly; but her son escaped with the precious original, and an imperfect copy was given them. She took refuge again in her *chateau* at Coppet, and dreary

months of anxiety were spent there, though she was soon surrounded by faithful friends, the *élite* minds of the age. All Europe, except Russia, was now controlled by Napoleon. His Swiss *gendarmes* demanded again her manuscript, but she would not surrender it. Her sons, as well as herself, were not allowed to re-enter France. Her home was under the surveillance of police spies. She was not permitted to travel, even in Switzerland, except between Coppet and Geneva. Schlegel was torn from her household and exiled; the Duke of Montmorency visited her, and was exiled; Madame Recamier, who, against her remonstrances, spent a night under her roof on her way to the baths of Aix, was exiled, and could never again return to Paris till the downfall of the tyrant.

We willingly record these painful details; they can be tedious to no man of letters, to no woman of heart. With similar facts before, and worse ones afterward, for which we have not room, they present a spectacle for the contemplation of the intellectual world—of, at least, all students of human nature: the little, great man of empire pursuing, with minutest inhumanity and egotism, a helpless woman of genius—helpless, yet greatest of her age, if not of any age. Great enough to conquer Europe, this man was not great enough to conquer himself. He was conquered by his own pettiest passions; and the truest function of history regarding him is to hold him forth before all eyes with the admonitory lesson that there is no real greatness of genius without the moral greatness of the heart.* After breaking down the whole political fabric of the continent for his own glory and that of his family; after sacrificing millions of French and other lives to his selfish ambition, he was to be cast out of Europe as an unendurable political nuisance; his restored dynasty was again to corrupt France till it should dissolve in official rottenness, and the bravest, most brilliant nation of modern times be over-run by foreign troops, and trodden in the dust with a humiliation unparalleled in the history of nations. The bewildered world still cries "Hosanna!" to the memory of Napoleon; but in the coming ages of better light and juster sentiments, when the glory of war shall be rightly estimated as

* "When Bonaparte insisted that the heart is one of the entrails, that it is the pit of the stomach that moves the world—do we thank him for the gracious instruction? Our disgust is the protest of human nature against a lie."—*Emerson.*

barbarism, which shall stand out worthiest and brightest in the recognition of mankind, the genius of the great military tyrant or that of the great suffering writer? Which alternative will enlightened France then choose for her homage, her greatest man of blood or her greatest woman of intellect? There are men who will brush aside such reflections as merely rhetorical, but destiny itself will reinstate them. Alluding to her sufferings Madame de Staël says: "It may, perhaps, excite astonishment that I compare exile to death, but great men of antiquity and of modern times have sunk under it. Many a man has confronted the scaffold with more courage than he has been able to command in the loss of his country. In all codes of law perpetual banishment has been considered as one of the severest penalties; but here the caprice of one man inflicts, in a kind of sport, what conscientious judges have pronounced with regret on criminals." But her wrongs were yet to be adjudicated by "conscientious judges?" The conscience of the world is always right in its ultimate judgments, and wisdom and virtue have only need to wait. Says Emerson:—

> Culture alters the political *status* of an individual. It raises a rival royalty in a monarchy. It is king against king. It is ever the romance of history in all dynasties. It creates a personal independence which the monarch cannot look down, and to which he must often succumb. The history of Greece is at one time reduced to two persons, Philip, or the successor of Philip on one side, and Demosthenes, a private citizen, on the other. Kings feel that this is what they themselves represent. This is no red-kerchiefed, red-shirted rebellion, but royalty—Kingship. This is real kingship, and theirs only titular. Literary history and all history is a record of the power of minorities and of minorities of one.

Ever since the epoch of the Revolution France has been reeling between the alternatives of the personal government, exemplified by Bonaparte, and the constitutional liberty for which her greatest authoress pleaded and suffered. Destiny will infallibly decide at last for the latter; no other final decision is possible under the moral laws of the universe.

Madame de Staël dreaded imprisonment with a morbid terror. It might be for life. She would flee, but whither? She would escape to England or America, and had invested funds in the latter for the purpose; but Napoleon controlled all the ports, except those of Russia, and he was about to invade that country.

Taking with her the "Allemagne," she left secretly, with her children and her second husband, Rocca. Schlegel joined them at Berne, and they hastened through Germany, through Austria, through Poland. Rocca disguised himself as a French courier, for, though he had resigned as a French officer, and was disabled by his honorable wounds, Napoleon tried to tear him from her by reclaiming him for the army. Descriptions of his person were distributed along their route. They read placards at the police stations every-where for their detection or obstruction. The events of their flight were, indeed, thrilling, but we cannot delay for them. Fleeing before the nearly half-million hosts of the conqueror, they at last enter Russia with thankful hearts; but the French army is between them and St. Petersburgh; they hasten to Moscow, but the invaders march thitherward—to their doom, indeed—but the exiles could not have anticipated that doom. They flee again, and by a wide detour reach the northern capital, where the Emperor Alexander receives them gladly. They reach the capital of Sweden, and are sheltered by her faithful friend, Bernadotte, the ally of the Czar. They at last reach London and are safe, and the "Allemagne" is saved to the intellectual world forever.

England knows little or nothing yet of the proscribed book, but the genius of its author is known there by her other works; she is recognized as the supreme woman in literature, and her persecutions by Napoleon command enthusiastic sympathy. She is immediately the idol of its best circles; and such is the eagerness to see her that "the ordinary restraints of high society," we are told, are quite disregarded; at the houses of cabinet ministers the first ladies of the kingdom mount chairs and tables to catch a glimpse of her. She dines daily with statesmen, authors, and artists, at the tables of Lords Landsdowne, Holland, Grey, Jersey, Harrowby, and surpasses all by her splendid conversation, not excepting Sheridan, Mackintosh, Erskine, and Byron.

The interest excited by her brilliant social qualities, her literary fame, and her persecutions, was suddenly and immeasurably enhanced by the publication of her "Germany," in London, in the autumn of 1813. It proved to the sober, practical English mind that the dazzling talker was also a profound thinker. No work from a feminine hand had ever

equaled it in masculine vigor and depth of thought, as well as of sentiment.

We have seen how the precious manuscript escaped the hands of the Government at Paris by the forethought of her son, and afterward by her own evasion of the police at Coppet. Secretly carried through all her flight over Germany, Poland, Russia, the Baltic Sea, and Sweden, it was now secured to the world by the press of England, and all intelligent Frenchmen have ever since been proud of it as one of the monuments of their national literature. In her preface she told the British public the story of its misfortunes, inserting the insulting letter of the Duke de Rovigo, the Minister of Police, ordering her out of France. "At the moment," she said, "when this work was about to appear, and when ten thousand copies had already been printed, the Minister of Police, known by the name of General Savary, sent his *gendarmes* to the publisher, with orders to cut in pieces the whole edition. Sentinels were stationed at the different issues of the building, to prevent the escape of a single copy of so dangerous a book. A commissioner of police was charged to superintend this expedition. General Savary obtained an easy victory, but the poor commissioner died, I am told, from his anxious labors to make sure, in detail, of the destruction of so many volumes, or, rather, of their transformation into pasteboard, perfectly white, upon which no trace of human reason should remain. The intrinsic value of this card-paper, estimated at twenty *louis*, was the only indemnity that the publisher obtained from the minister. At the moment my book was destroyed at Paris, I received an order, in the country, to surrender the copy from which it had been printed, and to leave France in twenty-four hours." Such a statement could not but excite the wonder of England. Such a petty, persecuting policy on the part of Napoleon was inconceivable to the British mind, accustomed to the utmost liberty of thought and speech, and almost as unrestricted liberty of the press. The incredible history of the work now gave it incredible success.

She appended to her preface a brief outline of its design and plan. "I had thought," she said, "that it would be beneficial to make known the country of Europe where study and meditation have been carried so far that we may consider it the

land of thought. The reflections which the country and its books have suggested to me may be divided into four sections. The first will treat of Germany and the Manners of the Germans: the second of Literature and Art; the third of Philosophy and Morals; the fourth of Religion and Enthusiasm."

The "Allemagne" could not, like "Delphine" and "Corinne," appeal to popular readers, the readers of "light literature," but it commanded immediately and universally the interest of the enlightened classes. We have noticed how Byron admired it in spite of his cynical dislike of her conversation and her person. Mackintosh immediately reviewed it in the "Edinburgh Quarterly." "The voice of Europe," he said, "has already applauded the genius of a national painter in the author of 'Corinne.' But it was there aided by the power of a pathetic fiction, by the vanity and opposition of national character, and by the charm of a country which unites beauty to renown. In the work before us she has thrown off the aid of fiction. She delineates a less poetical character, and a country more interesting by expectation than by recollection. But it is not the less certain that it is the most vigorous effort of her genius, and probably the most elaborate and masculine production of the faculties of woman." The chapters which treat of society and conversation, he remarks, are the most perfect, and "exhibit an unparalleled union of graceful vivacity with philosophical ingenuity." The chapter on Taste, he says, is "exquisite," "balancing with a skillful and impartial hand the literary opinions of nations." The third part, which treats of Metaphysical Systems, is, he adds, "a novelty in the history of the human mind, and, whatever may be thought of its success in some of the parts, must be regarded on the whole as the boldest effort of the female intellect." The concluding portion of the work, on Enthusiasm, he pronounces the most eloquent, "if we except the incomparable chapter on Conjugal Love." "Thus," he says, after a long citation, "terminates a work which, for variety of knowledge, flexibility of power, elevation of view, and comprehension of mind, is unequaled among the works of women, and which, in the union of the graces of society and literature with the genius of philosophy, is not surpassed by many among those of men."

The London edition was issued by Murray in three volumes,

12mo. In the following year it was reproduced in Paris and Geneva, and in an Italian version at Milan. In the next year another edition appeared in Paris, in four volumes, 12mo, and in three volumes, 8vo. In less than two years later a revised edition was issued in Paris in two volumes, 8vo. Editions and translations followed in all the principal tongues of Europe.

So imposing a work could not fail to provoke criticism, and, besides innumerable "periodical" reviews, no less than six publications, discussing its merits and demerits, appeared in less than a year in the German, French, and English languages from the presses of Heidelberg, Hanover, Bremen, Paris, London, and Edinburgh.

It is from the stand-point of the romantic school that Madame de Staël considers Germany. The two Schlegels, Ludwig Zieck, Goerres, Brentano, Arnim, Kleist, were then the representatives of that school, and Goëthe was hailed as their chieftain, though the universality of his genius rendered him superior to the limitations of any literary sect. These writers endeavored to be national by reproducing exclusively the spirit of the elder German literature and legends—the idiosyncrasies of the northern mind. They succeeded to some extent, in spite of the claims of culture on all the possibilities of literature and art. Madame de Staël wrote under their inspiration, and thereby painted a more genuine picture of intellectual and social Germany than she could otherwise have produced. An able German critic remarks that it is important her readers should bear in mind this stand-point of her "remarkable work." She took it spontaneously, though influenced by her favorite German authors; her previous work on "Literature" showed her predilections for the romantic school; it is pervaded by the ideas of that school, and she was among the first of its founders in France. She gives in the "Allemagne" a fine chapter, discriminating the two schools. She says:—

> The songs of the Troubadours, born of chivalry and Christianity, originated in the poetry of the romantic school. If we do not admit that paganism and Christianity, the north and the south, antiquity and the Middle Ages, chivalry and the Greek and Roman institutions, divide the empire of literature, we shall never be able to judge, from a philosophic stand-point, ancient and modern taste. Classic poetry is simple and salient, like exterior objects;

Christian poetry has need of all the colors of the rainbow. But the question for us is not between the classic and romantic poetry, but between the imitation of the one and the inspiration of the other. The literature of the ancients is with the moderns a literature transplanted; the romantic literature is with us indigenous; it is the product of our religion and our institutions.

The fact that she was the principal founder of the romantic school in French literature shows the silent energy of her genius. Romanticism is legitimate in its own sphere. Its chief fault was its exclusiveness, for the capabilities of art are as manifold as the needs of culture. While vindicating the romantic school, Madame de Staël did not exclude classicism. The partisan spirit provoked by its theorists was irrelevant. Leminier remarks that "one party repeated, with Madame de Staël and the Schlegels, that romanticism came forth from Christianity and chivalry; another, with some English critics and poets, that its origin was in Saxon and Norman traditions. There were still others, more refined, more metaphysical, who saw in romanticism the expression of the most profound sentiments of the soul, and an indefinable idea. There was a resonant shock of systems and theories." Romanticism, which produced, besides Madame de Staël, such writers as Chateaubriand and Lamartine, and has culminated in our day in the splendid genius of Victor Hugo, has enriched the literature of the modern without impairing the literary claims of the ancient world. Leminier affirms a truth, though not without a spice of malice, when he says that "Hugo, wishing to establish his title as chief of the romantic school, its Aristotle, has appropriated the ideas long since put in circulation by Madame de Staël, the Schlegels, Sismondi, and Benjamin Constant, and thrust them to an extreme." The romantic school has seen the end of its day as an exclusive sect; it will never see the end of its day as a legitimate and brilliant school by the side of classicism. It is as legitimate there as the Gothic architecture is by the side of the Greek.

Considered as the initiative of foreign criticism on German literature, Sainte-Beuve esteems the "Allemagne" a work which "no other person could have produced at that period." Madame de Staël was the first writer who effectively disclosed not only to France, but to Europe generally, the rich mines of

the German intellect. She was the first of French writers to vindicate Shakspeare against the prejudices of Voltaire. Villemain says:—

The unity of such a work is in the soul of the author, in the spirit, the *verve*, continuous, yet ever varied, with which she treats of so many and such diverse topics. We admire the penetrating glance which it casts on all the literature of a nation, its profound intelligence, the vivid sensibility which gives to the analysis all the interest of passion and all the novelty of inspiration. The poetry of the north, with what vivacity Madame de Staël reproduces and interprets it! . . . This book, this enthusiasm of literary independence, this apotheosis of duty, this ardor of spiritualism, were in reality an indirect and continual protestation against the system of government which then dominated France. . . . The work of Madame de Staël, all animated with a sort of moral independence, breathing hatred of personal interest, enthusiasm for noble sacrifice, for liberty, the liberty of the soul subjected to the single law of duty, shocked the political maxims of the conqueror. The passion which reigns in the book, and which animates it with a single spirit in all the diversity of its subjects and forms—it is moral sentiment.

Lamartine speaks of the "Allemagne" with all his poetic ardor. We have seen in part his opinion. He adds:—

Appearing about the same time in England and France, it became the subject of the conversation of Europe. Her style, without losing any of its youthful vigor and splendor, seemed now to be illuminated with lights more high and eternal, as she approached the evening of life and the diviner mysteries of thought. This style paints no more, it chants no more, it adores. One respires the incense of a soul over its pages. It is "Corinne" become a priestess, and seeing from the border of life the unknown God beyond the horizons of humanity.

Vinet says:—

Its appreciations of authors and of works are spirited and delicate, and show rare penetration; its analyses are full of movement and life, and the cited passages are translated with great talent. Respect for genius and the sentiment of the beautiful illuminate every step of the writer. French prejudice nowhere makes her misapprehend true beauties; nor does her enthusiasm, or docility, or contempt for mere novelty, ever lead her, as so many others, to mistake a deformed idol for a divinity.

Vinet, like Sainte-Beuve, claims for the work a high moral and political purport. He says:—

It was one of those life-boats which, in the stress of the storm, is employed courageously for the salvation of a ship in distress,

The ship was France, all the liberties of which were, in the opinion of Madame de Staël, perishing at the time. Persuaded that the nations are called to help one another, she went this time to demand from Germany, humiliated and conquered Germany, the salvation of France. There is more of patriotism than of national egotism in the work.... It inaugurated in literature a new era. For good or for evil its influence was capital. It put an end to the isolation of two great neighboring nations. It revealed for the first time Germany to France. All Germany does not appreciate this fact; but hear what Goethe wrote in his old age: "This book," he said, "ought to be considered as a powerful engine which made a wide breach in the Chinese wall of antiquated prejudice which divided the two countries; so that beyond the Rhine, and afterward beyond the channel, we became better known—a fact that could not fail to procure for us a great influence over all western Europe." Vinet thinks that the "Allemagne" marks the point of maturity of thought and of talent in Madame de Staël; that in style it is the richest, and in moral sentiment the most advanced, of all her works. "It is in the 'Allemagne,' if I am not deceived, and particularly in its last part, that she shows herself, above all, a poet." In approaching the regions of supreme truth, and, by consequence, of repose, she has felt commence in her soul that harmonious concert of sensibility and imagination which is properly poetry. Without making use, as in "Corinne," of poetical phraseology, without deviating from the movement of prose, she sings, perhaps for the first time.

The "Allemagne," as Goethe admits, breached the wall that had barricaded the German literature. It did so for England as well as for France, and finally for the whole exterior intellectual world. Some twenty years earlier Scott, influenced chiefly by Lewis, (author of the "Monk," and a thorough German scholar,) had given intimations of the wealth of German thought, and made some translations from Burger, and, later, from Goethe, but lost money by their publication. Thirteen years before the appearance of the "Allemagne" Coleridge published his translation of Schiller's "Wallenstein," and began to talk German philosophy among his friends; but Englishmen continued to think the language inexorable, if not barbarous, and the originality of the German mind fantastic, and incompatible with British "common sense." The "Allemagne" dispelled this prejudice, and, revealing the abundant treasures of German genius and learning, opened the way for that influx of German thought which, principally by the subsequent labors of Coleridge and Carlyle, has, for good or evil,

been flooding the English mind, and transforming English scholarship, criticism, and speculation.

It was its author's good fortune to write it at a time when the German intellect was at its zenith, culminating in Goethe, and illustrated by a splendid array of other lights—by Klopstock, Schiller, Wieland, Winkleman, Lessing, Herder, Tieck, Richter, the Schlegels, Werner, Wolf, Jacobi, Kant, Fichte, Schelling,* and almost innumerable others, most of them still living when she last visited Germany. The enduring products of the German mind have since multiplied vastly in every department, but its splendor at the epoch of the "Allemagne" has never been surpassed, and probably never can be. Yet the book has, by the course of time alone, become deficient, but not obsolete, and never can be, as a survey of German life and literature. It abounds also in special faults; its critical estimates are sometimes inadequate, at others exaggerated. But works of genius, as we have affirmed, are essentially immortal. It is the distinction of genius that it imparts somewhat of its own personality to its productions. "Style is the man;" and style, of both thought and expression—the individuality of the artist—is the everlasting charm of classic works. The touch of genius thus gives enduring life to even obsolete facts. It is like the word of the prophet in the "valley of vision;" the dry bones rise up at its bidding, embodied and embattled. The fragments of the Parthenon sculptures are precious, not because of their mythologic fictions, but because, in their very ruins, they still glow with the genius of Phidias. The "Allemagne" is imbued with the richest genius of its author, with exalted sentiment, with profound thought, with grand moral truth, with the eloquence of style, with the power, the essence, of a great soul. There is scarcely a page of it which does not present something that the world can never willingly let die. As a monument of intellect, especially of a woman's intellect, it is classic and immortal.

It would betray an unpardonable lack of sensibility were we to feel no profounder sentiment than mere satisfaction with

*Hegel, whose later influence on German thought was so important, is not mentioned by her, though he began his first lectures at Jena, near Weimar, in 1801, two years before her arrival in Weimar, and published his work on Schelling in the same year, and his Phenomenology of the Soul in 1807.

this signal literary triumph. In its peculiar circumstances it is a spectacle for generous, for enthusiastic, admiration. It is a vindication of the supremacy of the human intellect, of that sovereignty of mind which, from the prisons of Boethius, Tasso, Cervantes, and Bunyan, from the exile of Dante and Spinoza, and from the humiliation of the old age and poverty of Milton have sent forth through all the world and all time proofs, if not of the invulnerability, yet of the invincibility, of genius, irradiating their names with honor when the sword or the scepter which oppressed them has sunk into oblivion or ignominy. Throughout her prolonged sufferings the intellect of this persecuted woman has been ever in the ascendant. Its every new production has been superior to its preceding one. The victory of the pen over the scepter is now, in her case, incontestable. "Corinne" is crowned anew in the land of constitutional liberty with laurels gathered in "the land of thought." Meanwhile the crown is falling from the brow of her heartless persecutor. She had fled over Europe, with her proscribed manuscript, before his armed hosts. He knew that she was fleeing in his front, as we have seen by his attempts to embarrass her flight, and to seize Rocca. His hosts have been rolled back in disastrous overthrow from the ruins of the ancient capital of the land which then gave her shelter, leaving in their retreat more than 250,000 dead men, victims of the sword or the climate. His unparalleled energies rallied again, and he triumphed at Lutzen, at Bautzen, at Dresden. But in the very month in which the "Allemagne" issued from the London press was fought the great "battle of the nations," as it has been called. Germany, united, rose with overwhelming resentment, and, on the battle-field of Leipsic, broke forever the domination of the tyrant. The "Edinburgh Quarterly" appeared, with Mackintosh's superb review of the "Allemagne," amid the acclamations of England over the great victory—the resurrection of the people, whose intellectual claims it had vindicated. In less than six months Napoleon abdicated, and the authoress, now the most distinguished woman of Europe, re-entered the French capital. Her "Corinne" had been the apotheosis of Italy; her "Allemagne," delayed by her persecutor till the resurrection of Germany and his own downfall, was now her own apotheosis.

A battle was fought on the 30th of March, 1814, under the walls of Paris, and the allies entered the city. Madame de Staël's reappearance there was another social triumph. Her *salon* was again opened and thronged. Her friends returned; Montmorency and Châteaubriand to take office, and Madame Recamier, from her exile in Italy, to embellish the society of the capital with her undiminished beauty. The Government paid to the authoress the two millions of Necker's claim. She saw her daughter married to the Duc de Broglie, and placed in the highest ranks of French society. Her fame filled Europe; no queen had more. She had been faithful, and had triumphed at last. The "Hundred Days" threatened that triumph, but Waterloo secured it.

The world knows well the remainder of the remarkable story. The persecutor—the greatest captain of his age, if not of any age—died, himself an exile on the rock of St. Helena; his victim—the greatest feminine writer of her age, if not of any age—became the idol of his lost capital, the intellectual empress of Europe, and died peacefully in her restored Parisian home—Lafayette, Wellington, royal personages from the Tuileries, the representatives of all European Courts, inquiring daily at her door, and the world feeling that by her death, in the language of Châteaubriand, "society was struck with a general disaster;" that "it made one of those breaches which the fall of a superior intellect produces once in an age, and which can never be closed."

## Art. II.—TAYLER LEWIS: IN MEMORIAM.

The name of Tayler Lewis is so well known to the world of letters, and especially to all students of the biblical word, that we can hope to add but little to the general knowledge already possessed regarding him, and that little our own personal experience gained during a long intercourse in social and professional relations. Our object in the following pages will, therefore, rather be to collate, condense, and arrange whatever of interest relates to his character and career than to enter into any extended criticism regarding his genius and the labors of

his pen and brain. This latter work has already been done by abler hands than these, and the world is so well acquainted with the profound scholar that we opine it will be more ready to hear of Tayler Lewis the man, as he lived and moved among his family and his fellow-men, and walked and talked in his daily life.

And even this lowly task is no easy one, for the simplest words and deeds of Dr. Lewis were full of the significance of the sage, the Christian, and the scholar; and, therefore, even in this sphere we may hope in vain to weave a garland worthy of his brow. We shall be satisfied if our simple story may find a fitting resting-place at his feet.

Dr. Lewis was a graduate of Union College, to which he finally gave the prime of his life and the perfect fullness of his labors. He graduated in 1820, with such rare men for classmates as Seward, Kent, and Hickok, after a college career of rare promise. At the close of his academic studies he entered on those of law, which he so far completed in Albany that he was enabled to commence practice in a little town on the upper Hudson, with no apparent conception that he was fitted for a higher sphere of labor in his profession. But, unconsciously, he felt a void that his eager and busy nature longed in some way to fill, and he therefore pursued with energy his classical studies, and especially the broad range of linguistics, with Hebrew in the foreground, which finally led him to the investigation of biblical lore.

He soon, however, began to feel that the law was not a profession to which he could devote his peculiar gifts, or in which he could find the highest satisfaction, and he, consequently, entered the career of teaching, at first in a classical school in Waterford, and later in Ogdensburgh, N. Y. In the meanwhile his expanding genius and growing works were not unnoticed by those among whom he began his learned career, and he was, consequently, soon honored with a call to deliver the annual oration before the Phi Beta Kappa of his *Alma Mater*. In performing this honorable task he treated of "Faith, the Life of Science," and in words so fitting and thoughts so inspiring and convincing, that he sealed his own brow with the stamp of an acute and patient scholar.

This successful effort soon gained for him calls to several of

the colleges of the land, and he was elected for the University of New York, where he labored with great success in the Chair of Greek for some eleven years, supplementing the teaching of the class-room with the more retired labors in his study by giving his individual attention to the whole range of Classical and Oriental Philology. The world soon became aware of this industry in the publication of a translation of Theætetus with notes, which was followed by the tenth book of Plato's Dialogue—"Plato Against the Atheists"—enriched by deep and learned critical notes.

These valuable contributions to the world of classic letters soon made him widely known to scholars, and so increased the pride of his *Alma Mater* that she was glad to call him back to the home where he began his career. He had become doubly attached to the University of New York, but found still stronger the ties that drew him to his early literary home; and, therefore, though at some sacrifice of the opportunities that a large city offers to the scholar in the line of means for learned investigation, he resolved to accept the call to the Chair of Greek in Union College, which he assumed in 1849.

Here he seized his pen with renewed vigor, and soon surprised the world with his "Six Days of Creation," the best known, perhaps, of all his works, in which he developed the coincidence of Scripture and geology. This was received with many sharp and bitter criticisms, especially from the pen of Prof. Dana; and these attacks called forth numerous defenses from his friends and from himself in the form of "The Bible and Science." At a later date he published the "Divine Human in the Scriptures."

And while the one hand was engaged in this very scholarly work, the other was busy fighting the battles of the world in the "Editor's Table" of "Harper's Magazine" for some five years, after which his fugitive articles in periodicals, magazines, and quarterlies, on theology, philology, and nearly every living interest, became still more frequent and copious. When the Southern Rebellion broke out his heart beat high for the cause of political unity and human liberty for even the humblest of the race; and in the treatise on "State Rights" he presented a photograph of the "Ruins of Ancient Greece," as a prolific lesson and a solemn warning to those who would imitate the

follies of that land from which we have learned so many valuable lessons. This was followed by "Heroic Periods in a Nation's History," showing how his active brain and patriotic heart were ready to lay their contributions on the altar of his country's needs.

Our own acquaintance and professional relations with Dr. Lewis commenced at the close of the war, at which period he turned his attention more than ever to biblical study and research. His very first conversation was about the wealth of German lore, the richness of German idiom, and especially the wonderful depths of German theological investigation. Into these he longed to plunge, but had been prevented by other pressing duties and by a more than ordinary difficulty which he confessed to have felt in examining the tongue with a view to its acquisition. And, strange to say, his trouble seemed to consist more in the minor words and uninflected particles than in those in which most scholars find their greatest difficulty. The longest and most far-fetched words were the easiest, from the fact of their derivation from other tongues, and their logical composition in imitation of the Greek; but the particles, which from their very nature must be national, idiomatic, and arbitrary, gave him such trouble, that for these little things he could not have the patience to give so much valuable time.

Just then Dr. Lewis had received a flattering invitation to undertake the translation and annotation of the Book of Genesis in the famous "Bible Work" of the great German theologian, Dr. John Peter Lange—the most celebrated biblical Commentary of the age, having its origin in a group of German scholars, with Dr. Lange as the chief worker and projector. Under the general editorial control of Dr. Philip Schaff this work was being prepared for the American public by another group of distinguished biblical scholars in this country. Dr. Schaff's critical eye soon saw that the author of "Six Days of Creation" would be just the man to do the fullest justice to the Genesis of this series, and was, therefore, desirous of placing Dr. Lewis at the head of the American forces.

Dr. Lewis felt that the annotation would meet his taste, and afford him a field for his peculiar range of study; but the slow and plodding work of translation had no charms for him, especially in view of the extreme and laborious difficulty of the

task when German theologians afford the subject-matter. In this dilemma he appealed to the author of this sketch, who begged to be excused from a task so dry and uninviting, and so alien to the ordinary line of his work and study as a layman. But Dr. Lewis had fixed his mind on annotating Genesis, and said, in almost pathetic words, "If you will translate it for me I will annotate it, but my health is too feeble to undertake both."

Now, to know Dr. Lewis was to love him, and to love him was to serve him; and so we for a time yielded, until he became more familiar with the work in the first place, and was finally able to procure more efficient aid from a professional theologian. One great difficulty to such mutual labor was the doctor's increasing deafness, which had been growing on him for years, and which at this period was so decided that one could only communicate with him by means of an ear-trumpet. But this inability to communicate with the outer world made him more inclined to go within himself, and there concentrate all his powers—and this he did in the work now before him. The result was a volume of unexampled worth in the exegesis of the Bible story of the creation, and a most valuable introduction to the extensive series.

It was extremely difficult for the inquiring and sometimes imaginative mind of Dr. Lewis to accord in all respects with the views of the distinguished author, and the result is an extensive series of notes with the well known initials "T. L.," in which he either questioned some position of the book, or added valuable thoughts from his own treasury. In a recent interview that we enjoyed with Dr. Lange, in his home in Bonn, on the Rhine, the aged scholar spoke with great respect of Dr. Lewis, but hinted that he had added considerable matter to the original. In short, it may be well to say just here that Dr. Lewis rarely touched a commentator without improving on him, and that the opinions of many scholars unite in the verdict that the American edition is a great improvement on the German, largely from the work done on it by the subject of this sketch.

And here we may also say that not a few of Dr. Lewis' friends regret that he, instead of being the commentator of the commentators, had not for himself blocked out a field of orig-

inal labor in this respect, and become the American commentator *par excellence*. But Dr. Lewis' many-sidedness was, in one sense, his misfortune; his views and arenas were so broad, and his depth of vision so great, that it was difficult for him to confine himself to one course of study exclusively. He lived in the world with an intensity that knew no bounds, and was so broadly humanitarian that scarcely a week would pass that did not bring up something that would call him off from a steady career. The result was a vast amount of desultory work, which, collected together, would form a veritable library, but which in its scattered condition, floating on every billow that tossed the nation or agitated the schools, had its intense but transient effect, and then disappeared on the troubled waters, leaving an influence which, though his, was scarcely attributed to his genius.

The nervous wear on his feeble frame in the work on Genesis caused him to fear to undertake any more of this Bible series, and for awhile he rested from this line of labor. But he was soon seized with a great desire to make a metrical version of the "Preacher Solomon" in connection with a commentary on the text, and the opportunity was offered to him in the Ecclesiastes of the great German "Bible Work." But here again came up the matter of the translation; with this he could not be burdened, and again came to us the appeal to take up the laboring oar. We plead incapacity, incompatibility, and various other short-comings—all the time, as we knew, having the wishes of his loving family at our back, that in his weakness and age he might abstain from such wearing work. But in vain. His loving manner and enthusiastic spirit again got the better of our judgment, and came off victors; and our share of the work was the entire translation placed in his hands, while he would turn the prose poem into meter, and annotate it.

Now, however, came up a new feature of the breadth of the doctor's genius. We confess to misgivings as to his power in the arena of the poet, and had our doubts as to his success in handling so sublime a theme in so difficult a garb, and at one time wished that we might dissuade him from the attempt. But, to our surprise, we found him high master in this art, to which men are rather born than fashioned. In his study of the ancient classics he had found no more congenial task than that

of their metrical structure, and had studied this with the greatest success, until he had become an oracle.

In the "Iris," or "Literary Messenger," published in New York in 1841, the leading article, of about twenty compact pages, is an essay on the "Ancient Meters," from an unpublished treatise, of which this appears as an isolated chapter. But as we look over it, and see how deeply and exhaustively it treats of all the laws of classic verse, and how page after page is full of illustrations of the metrical system, presented mostly in lines from the Greek poets, we are led to exclaim, as did recently the incumbent of a classic chair in one of our colleges when this was shown to him, "Wonderful!" Why this should lie buried, and Dr. Lewis receive comparatively no credit and no special advantage from it, is again one of the unselfish marvels of the man. But his was the pleasure to create—he had but the smallest capacity to draw pecuniary profit from his labor.

This fact, however, dispelled all fears as to his success in giving to this interesting book a still more attractive garb; and the end crowned the work, as the readers of the metrical version of "Koheleth" will attest, as well as the treatise on the poetical character of the book.

The crowning triumph, however, in this line, was reserved for the Book of Job. Dr. Lewis had again resolved to do no more work of this kind; but here again the temptation was too strong. He had long held sweet communion with the man of Uz, admired his humility and patience in suffering, and longed, also, to place his touching story into more stately garb, and throw around it the light of his long investigation and reflection. To Dr. Lewis Job was in some regard the hero of sacred story, and a character of whose history he never tired. He had let pass no opportunity to obtain all that had been written about him in the course of biblical commentary, and what he did not possess he obtained, regardless of cost or trouble, and, thus armed, he proceeded with his last work of love in scriptural commentary.

The reader who will refer to the book will see the proud result in an introduction that is well worthy of forming a stately volume of itself—that will, doubtless, some time take this shape. Had it been published as an independent treatise,

with the simple title, "Lewis on Job," it would certainly have gained a large circulation. As it is, only those who can possess the massive volume, or the lengthy series, can enjoy it. In the general introduction he makes a masterly analysis of the poetry of the Bible, the spirit of Hebrew poetry, true poetic merit, lyric and didactic poetry, etc.; and then proceeds to a thorough and exhaustive criticism of the Book itself, commencing with its grandeur and purity, and proceeding through the whole category of its rich and rare qualities, leaving no valuable characteristic untouched and no authority disregarded, and crowning the whole with his own reflections, and the result of many years of profound and exhaustive study. We need scarcely say that the result is the crowning work of his life, and a fitting one with which to close so long a series of intellectual efforts, as it was virtually his last great labor.

But this about exhausted the physical strength of the venerable sage; and even while engaged in it he was from time to time obliged to stop and take rest, that he might reach another *stadium*. And he seemed to fear sometimes that he might not reach the goal, and worked, knowing that the King's business admits of no delay. His Master was pleased, however, to spare his life until the completion of this work, when the venerable man lay down to die—but not to rest. While on his sick-bed he accepted an engagement to furnish a series of Expositions of Sabbath-school Lessons, extending over six months, for the "Sunday-School Times;" and this he could only do by dictation to his devoted daughter, who at his bedside thus wrote them out.

And in this closing work of his life for the love of the children, in imitation of his Master, he again showed, under the most trying circumstances, his intimate knowledge of the sacred word. His conversation was always beautiful—here it seemed almost inspired. He was so full of the Bible that he seldom needed to refer to it, and when he did so it was with an accuracy quite surprising. He would direct his daughter to such a book, chapter, and verse—he might fail a little in this latter, but what he desired was almost surely found in the chapter quoted. In this work his heart was greatly touched with the devotion of his family, and, as we have it from the lips of wife and daughter, he sweetly said one day, in regarding them vying

with one another to serve him: "Ruskin has written much about the beauties of nature, but he has never seen any thing so beautiful as my dear wife and devoted daughter tending night and day to all my wants."

A great trial to Dr. Lewis, and one which he could not always bear without repining, was his total deafness in his latter years, for toward the last he was absolutely entirely void of the power of hearing. When others would start at the loud thunder-clap, he would only know of it by the flash that preceded it, for hear it he could not. This rendered all free intercourse with him absolutely impossible, for he did not seem so much as some persons to divine from the movements of the lips the subject of their speech; he was too impatient to know what was said to follow this slow and doubtful process. All that was said to him, therefore, was communicated by writing; but he had the faculty of divining often from the commencement of a sentence what would be its end, and he was so happy himself in conversation that a few sentences would start him off into some train of golden thought that needed few words from others; he was a perfect conversationalist, without the magic inspiration of reply to his propositions.

But it annoyed him greatly to see others engaged in animated conversation while he knew nothing of the subject of it, and at times, when we thought him quietly resting, or even dozing on his lounge with his family, he would ask to know what we were conversing about. Sometimes the answer would quiet him for awhile, and then again it would start him off into a train of conversation quite foreign to the subject under discussion, because, with the curtness of the written explanation, he had not fully comprehended the full scope of the friendly talk. He never seemed fully conscious of his condition in this respect, and almost rebelled against accepting it. Even in the darkness of the night he would rise up and ask his wife questions that it was impossible for her to answer, because he then could neither see nor hear. And this led him to have fears in regard to his eyes. "What if I should lose my sight, also?" he would sometimes exclaim, in despair at the possibility of such an overwhelming misfortune—and one which he had no reason to anticipate, for his eyes were excellent, and did him yeoman service during a long life.

At times he would mourn even to sadness at this affliction. In the early spring he delighted to wander over the college grounds and campus and in the groves, and then his eyes never failed to see the birds, but their melody fell dead on his ears. On one occasion, while walking with him, he exclaimed, "How beautiful is all this! but how it is marred to me by the quiet of the grove! You can hear the singing of the birds, which is absolutely needed to this heavenly harmony, but to me all is quiet as the sepulcher!" He would frequently say to eminent divines, who made a pilgrimage of love to his study or his bedside in his dying days, "Pray with me; I cannot hear you, but I can feel that you are communing with God."

Perhaps his greatest trial in this regard was his inability to hear the sweet Christian hymns in which his soul delighted, and which he loved to hear sung when yet his ears could catch the melody; among these were, "When I can read my title clear," "There is a land of pure delight," and the chorus, "O, that will be joyful!" And even when his own voice was dead to him he would hum these tunes, often in the stillness of the night, and thus was frequently heard repeating to himself aloud, when racked with pain and uneasy with suffering, such favorite expressions as, "I know that my Redeemer liveth!"

And still the fact that he almost refused, in one sense, to accept his deafness, made it less trying for him to bear it, because he so often acted as if it were not so. He was alive to every thing that occurred in the world, and when he was specially excited by some political event or theological heresy in popular preachers, he would make his way up to the business office of the college, where the faculty are accustomed to drop in during the morning, and, seizing on the first one whom he met, he was likely to deliver a pungent diatribe on the absurdity or wickedness of whatever was the subject of his thoughts, as if the unlucky wight whom he had caught were the guilty party. In these discussions there was no "talking back;" the doctor had matters all his own way; but this quite as often proved a relief to the attacked party, whose silence was gold where speech would have been but silver. These scenes sometimes became quite ludicrous—now because his sharp switch stung some one who was asking, "Is it I?" and again because all present by

affirmative nods were trying to make him understand that we thought just as he did, and that in this relation he was enacting the battle of the windmills.

And this gives us an easy transition to the intense sympathy of Dr. Lewis in all that was going on in the world. Nothing escaped his attention that was of ordinary interest; indeed, it may even be said that he troubled himself often about trifling things, that were not worthy of his steel; but he seemed sometimes to feel as if the responsibility of having the world go on properly was on his shoulders, and that he was in some way to blame if it did not. He could scarcely wait to have the mail arrive with the periodicals which he was accustomed to read, or to which he contributed. His daily walk was to the post-office and back, sometimes several times, and the residents of the avenue through which he passed were quite accustomed to see go by a small, delicately-built man, with fragile frame and massive head, from which flowed down to his shoulders a rich mass of hair, growing yearly more and more gray.

His forehead seemed almost to shelve over his deeply-sunken and flashing eyes, that in repose were directed to the ground, but in agitation gazed with anxious look, as if to find some kindred spirit with whom to have communion of thought. He was quite indifferent to dress, often verging on carelessness, until sometimes he would wake up to the fact that his wardrobe needed renewal, and then for a time would seem as proud as a child of his renovation in garb. He usually wore a large felt hat, that not unfrequently would slip back on his head as he wandered along absorbed in thought, while he carried a slight cane usually across the small of his back, behind which his arms were trussed, as the wings of a fowl ready for the oven. He carried his cane so continually in this style that it finally acquired a bend to fit his back, so that in case of a new one he needed to break it in, as one does new boots.

So characteristic and scholarly was his appearance that any stranger regarding him would have declared him a philosopher and thinker, and all the world around him, great and small, knew that this peculiar figure was Dr. Lewis. When for a few days he would disappear from his accustomed walks it would be whispered around that Dr. Lewis was sick, and it was quite a trial toward the last for him to give them up. In his

latter years he was subject to spells of vertigo, so that he was liable to fall down, in the post-office or on the way; and this, in addition to his deafness, made it quite dangerous for him to cross the railroad; and still he ventured out, beyond the limits of prudence. To induce him not to do so, his family would often send an early messenger to anticipate his errand, and thus prevent it. One day it was not possible to do this immediately, when he prepared to go himself. His daughter begged him not to, and promised that Bridget should soon go and get his mail. "Bridget!" said he, with a tone of ill-concealed contempt; "Bridget can't bring me the news of the Vermont election!"

But when his box of papers and magazines were emptied into his hands, he made his way home, absorbed all the way in the effort to read and walk at the same time, so that he neither saw nor knew any one that passed him; but all knew him, and deferentially gave way for him. It was amusing sometimes to meet him when a matter of more than general interest pleased or annoyed him, and he would look up from his sheet for some one to whom to talk. Just thus surcharged he once met the author of these lines the day after a distinguished divine of Brooklyn had been present at a banquet given to Tyndall, when his challenge to a prayer test was fresh in all minds, and when said banquet seemed an ovation to the scientist because he had thus cast a sneer at direct answer to prayer. The doctor talked so loud about this inconsistent conduct in the great preacher as to attract the attention of the passers-by, and only found relief in the resolution to go home and write a letter about it to the New York papers, which some of our readers will yet recollect in the columns of a prominent weekly.

Another time he stopped us on the street with the hasty question, "Did you see the paper last evening?" "Yes." "Did you see that base attack on Bismarck?" "Yes." "Well, now, go directly home and write an article to set that editor right for this evening's paper. It is your duty to do so; you know all about Bismarck, and can show how false is every assertion in that article."

But the most characteristic incident showing the interest of Dr. Lewis in all national controversies, and his fatherly care for his younger colleague, is as follows: The latter had re-

ceived the appointment from his fellow-townsmen to deliver the oration on the occasion of the coming "Decoration Day." The evening journal had announced the fact in a few lines, and was scarcely in the hands of the citizens when we heard a loud rap at the door, which we knew to be that of Dr. Lewis, and we accordingly answered the call. It was the year when so much was said pro and con about decorating all the soldiers' graves in our cemeteries, whether of Northern or of Southern men. With flashing eyes the doctor said, "I see you are to deliver the oration on 'Decoration Day.'" We assented with a nod. "Have you written it yet?" "No; it will not be written." "Do you intend to favor the decorating of rebel graves?" "No; shall not discuss the subject at all." With this his frame relaxed, his eyes grew soft, he said a few kind words, placed his cane behind his back, and put his arms behind it, and thus walked, ponderingly and comforted, to his home. The honor of his colleague was yet safe.

It was a wonder to all his friends that, with this intensity of life, bearing not only his own burdens, domestic and professional, but also those of the country, and, indeed, we may say of humanity at large, his slender frame held out so long, and that he came near reaching the fourscore of the psalmist, when years are a burden and sorrow. He could well say, with the trite Latin proverb that he so often quoted, "I am a man, and nothing human is foreign to me;" but it seemed too much that he should bear all humanity's ills.

At a very early period he took part in the discussion of the slavery question, and, though at first quite conservative, he finally changed his views, and became the warmest defender of the slave. He studied slavery in all its aspects, biblical and otherwise, and has written a multitude of articles on this prolific subject. The most connected ones on this and kindred political subjects may be found in "Harper's Monthly," Editor's Table, from 1851 to 1856. And his hopes of the negro race in their native land may be found embodied in his addition to Blyden's book, entitled, "The People of Africa; Their Character, Condition, and Future Prospects." He was a great admirer of Blyden, the African scholar of Liberia, and assisted in introducing his book to the American public.

When the war came he saw as its results the abolition of

slavery and the preservation of the Union, or a complete failure; for he considered such conclusions the only logical ones. And he virtually enlisted for the war—not for three months or three years—with that mightier weapon than the sword. And he used his pen with untiring zeal and vigor, frequently consuming the midnight oil to prepare articles for the next day's press. And no pen more pungent, piercing, or trenchant than that of Tayler Lewis helped to sustain the Administration and the cause of the Union and liberty. Besides his published articles on Greeley and Lincoln, and the great crowd of statesmen of the war, *pro* or *con*, he corresponded much privately, and once thus replied to the flippant question, "What shall we do with the Negro?" "And pray, sir, what shall the Negro do with you? It is my logic, with no disrespect to any body, that one question is as fair as the other."

And in this conflict Dr. Lewis fought more than a mere war of words. His domestic circle was lessened by the absence of two who were nearest and dearest to him, whose fate was entwined around his own heart, and with whom he lived and suffered in the struggle, and one of whom it was his sad lot to follow to the grave in the prime of manhood, leaving behind a surviving family to mourn his loss, though to enjoy his honor. He had, therefore, the strongest reason to be at the front in every battle on the field, and lead off in every discussion in the press. This led him to live a life so nervously intense as to cause surprise that he bore up under it all with so frail a body. He was at one and the same time the young man in action and the old man in counsel, and thus fairly did double duty during all the course of the war.

And when it was ended he also bore all the burdens of reconstruction, lived with all national and State elections, and almost to his dying hour would daily inquire the progress of great measures of the nation with a lively interest in all that concerned the fate of the colored race. This intense interest in popular controversy frequently so absorbed his mind as to interfere with his literary work, and at times forced him to suspend it; for it was a fashion with him to follow the impulses of his heart, and rush into the fray where he thought that lances were to be crossed with false doctrines or injustice of any kind. He was so essentially by nature a controversialist

that if some luckless opponent haply quoted bad Latin or worse Greek, he would take him up in an instant, and impale him on Latin syntax or Greek prosody, and perhaps, as in one instance with a Catholic priest in Albany, write letter after letter on a matter comparatively trivial, thereby exhausting strength that he needed for weightier matters.

It was hard to induce him to engage in any thing that did not suit his taste, though he were offered a good compensation for the labor. He abhorred contract work, and would frequently reject it because he did not feel able to do it, and then persistently be engaged for weeks in writing letters to New York journals on matters of public discussion, for which he received no other remuneration than the satisfaction of having his say on the subject under discussion. We have several times been authorized to offer him work the best adapted to his talents, and which he could perform better than any other man, but he would decline, or put it off till a more convenient season, which never came, because humanity demanded his attention, or some injustice burdened his soul. In all these things he was unselfish to a fault; he did himself injustice in caring, in all his work, so little for his pecuniary interest. Most men with his power would have made it command a fortune, while he died poor, though he did work enough to make him rich had his matters been managed in a business way, or, indeed, had he received compensation for half of what he did.

The large number of young men that grew up under his guidance entertained a great respect for him as a teacher, and when, in after life, they began literary labor on their own account, they would court his criticism and advice; and in this way he has written stacks of letters, and numberless criticisms and introductions to books, as a labor of love and friendship. A favorable critique or introductory review of any book from Tayler Lewis was the best introduction that any worker, young or old, could covet on appearing before the public.

Not many teachers have lived who have had more admiring students. They hung upon his lips while in the class-room, and in after life frequently made a pilgrimage to his study, and even to his bedside, to pay him the homage of deep respect. At his death many of these testified to this love by letters written for their own or other journals, so that these, collected,

would make of themselves quite a little volume. As a representative of this large class, we will here let one of them, still a young man, speak for himself:—

The brief paragraph in the papers of Saturday last announcing the death of Tayler Lewis signified but little to the thousands who ran over it hastily in the news items of the day. But there are others, and their number is not small, to whom the announcement comes bringing with it the consciousness of a great loss to the nation and the world, and to some a sense of heavy and personal bereavement. Scholars will lament that one who was the ripest, the fullest, and the most profound of their number has closed the studies which were his delight, and in the pursuit of which he added so much to the intellectual wealth of his day. Theologians will realize that one of the acutest and most vigorous minds that ever entered the arena of religious controversialism, and one which brought with it the inspiration of a noble heart and high heroic manhood, has laid aside forever the weapons of dispute. Statesmen who have appreciated and enjoyed the close logic, the keen analysis, and the breadth and grasp of intellect which he brought to the consideration of political questions, will experience more than a momentary regret that his pungent and powerful utterances will no longer aid in molding the thoughts of the times. Thousands unknown to fame all over the land, who love the one Book which he, to whom the wealth of every language was familiar, loved better than all, will grieve at his death as that of a friend whom they have known, though never seen; for he did not deem it beneath him to devote his wide and varied learning to make plain to children the meaning of that volume which was his chief joy and consolation.

But with a pain keener than that of any or all these does the news of his death come to those who have sat under his teachings; who have heard from his own lips the words which others must take from the printed page; who have listened while the glorious passages of the Greek classics glowed with a new fervor, and seemed full of a grander inspiration as he interpreted them, his eyes kindling and his voice trembling with the sympathy awakened within him; who have found a beauty and a power of which they never dreamed before in the words of prophet and apostle, as he took the original versions, and rendered them in that pure and perfect English of which he was the consummate master. It is not, however, to his genius alone that this tribute of grief is rendered on the part of those who have enjoyed a daily intercourse with him in the relation of student to a professor. Their sorrow has a deeper source than the mere eclipse of intellectual brilliancy. It is due to the fact that much of whatever growth they have made toward a noble manhood they owe to the impulse received in their lecture-room and in his study, and from the example of the life which he lived—brave, and grand, and sweet.

This splendid tribute of pupil to teacher was morally due to Dr. Lewis for one of the most genial and heartfelt efforts of his life. He was a teacher and scholar of the old school, and had no great sympathy with many of the modern innovations which have been made in the training of the young. And at the university convocation, held in Albany, in 1874, he delighted and surprised the assembled regents and teachers of the State by a paper entitled "My Old School-master." This old school-master was the teacher of young Tayler Lewis for about four years. It was Rev. Cyrus Comstock, of Northumberland, N. Y., of whom Dr. Lewis, when seventy years of age, gave a delightful memoir, and whose style of instruction he held up for imitation in his paper read at the university convention. "It was there," the doctor says, "I learned my first lessons in spelling and reading, receiving at that early day an impression of truth and goodness that has ever kept its unfading aspect in my memory." The whole paper was a beautiful tribute to the piety and faithfulness of one who had helped to mold his early years, and the old school-master's virtues and methods were held up by his distinguished pupil as the foundation of the latter's career. But how little conception had the "old school-master" of the richness of the ground into which he was sowing seed that was destined to bring forth truly a hundred-fold!

And what more fitting threshold can we have than this, whereby to enter the study of Dr. Lewis, and spend a brief season among his books, which tell an eloquent story now that their lover and guardian is gone? His chair with arm-rest, his table, his lounge, his drawers and shelves, still remain just as he left them, for his family cannot yet bear to see a book removed or a piece of furniture take a new place. And it seems, indeed, almost presumption to handle these treasures without his presence to give to each its story and its value.

First of all comes his famous Hebrew Bible, filled with notes, in which he has recorded this undying line: "True, a very precious book." This came into his hands in 1829, and for fourteen years he read it through annually, and afterward very frequently. The book is full of notes of the most significant character, which prove the immense amount of thought he gave to its contents. He was very fond of altering the ver-

sions, and some of these alterations were very beautiful and highly poetical. The top of the back of the book is actually worn away by his fingers in pulling it so many, many times from the shelves. No wonder that one of his students recently attested that Dr. Lewis was a marvelous philologist, and that his Hebrew learning would have astonished a rabbi. It is said that he could tell every marked word in the Hebrew Bible, the number of times it was used in the Scriptures, and the particular shade of meaning in each instance; and the general physiognomy and notes of this old Bible might well support this assertion. But even this was not enough, for he had a little Hebrew psalter, which he carried in his pocket, that it might be ever with him for reference.

Then comes a copy of the Iliad, three hundred years old, also fingered through and through. This he read through very often, and he had read also twice over the whole forty-five plays extant of the Greek drama. And one smiles to see the enumeration of his preparatory course in Greek and Latin before he felt fitted to teach. All of the dialogues of Plato; nearly all of Aristotle, his physica, metaphysica, and his more specially physical treatises, and also his ethical and political writings; a large part of the lesser hexameter poetry, such as Apollonius, Rhodius, and Aratus, also Pindar and the pastoral poets; all of Thucydides, all of Herodotus, all of Xenophon, nearly all of Plutarch, Longinus, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, and the gnomic and epic poetry; all of Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, and all of Cicero. And here let us draw a long breath to say that all of these were read before he assumed his professorship in the University of New York.

These shelves contain a great many old books that we cannot find room to mention: indeed, it is a library of curiosities for the antiquarian, and among them are many manuscript volumes of his own annotations on difficult and disputed passages of the Bible—for it was his custom to catch the golden thought as it sped through his brain, and give it a habitation in his books while it was still fresh in his mind. And thus he was always full of matter for such learned treatises as the excursus on the "Rivers of Paradise," "The Flood," the "Confusion of Tongues," the "Idea of Future Life in the Old Testament," the "Law of Homicide," and many others. And these manu-

scripts were also rich sources of supply for the "Figurative Language of the Bible," or "The Bible Language of the Heart," the "Religious Responsibility of the State," and a number of other works in this vein, still in manuscript, that may yet be published.

This collection gives also the most ample evidence of Dr. Lewis' love for and devotion to the Oriental tongues. He was first aided in this work by a colleague in the New York University, a Jewish lecturer on the Hebrew idiom, and by him was led to study the later Hebrew rabbinical writings; and after he came to Union College he added the Arabic and Syriac to his repertory of Oriental idioms, and went on, indeed, with so many of these that he almost exhausted them. The only evidence that we find of any hesitation in this line in his library is a note in an Assyrian grammar, that this he did not fully understand.

But he finally so completely mastered the Koran that he studied a commentary on it in Arabic, and then began to make his own comments on the Koran and the commentary in Arabic in notes in the margin. And all these notes in the Oriental tongues were executed with great beauty and accuracy. His pen seemed to rival the printed page, and the latter seldom passed without a correction of some kind in relation to the marks or signs on or under the words, if not in the use of the words themselves. These manuscripts are beautiful as a picture sometimes, and a joy to look at. All that the doctor's pen touched was executed with manly strength and womanly neatness.

It may almost be said that Arabic notes were a specialty with him; they lie scattered around as if they were not diamonds, and greet one in the most unexpected places—adorning a Syriac Testament as a Hebrew Bible. He was a great admirer of Mohammed, and thought, with his favorite Blyden, the Negro scholar of a Liberian school, that Mohammedanism in Africa was to be in some sense the precursor of African civilization. This admiration the doctor carried over to Arabian lore outside of the Koran, and had scarcely any books that he appreciated more than those in the Arabic. We chanced one day to call on him after dinner, and found him reading the "Arabian Nights" in the original, as a pleasant pastime for

an hour after dinner, enriching the margin with Arabic notes.

But his great delight was a Euclid in Arabic, published in Rome in 1594. The venerable volume bears the mark of much handling; more by him, we judge, than any or all of its former owners. Why a distinguished philologist should take so much interest in Euclid may surprise some; but Dr. Lewis had all the characteristics for a great mathematician, had biblical investigation not so entirely absorbed his mind. He was an adept in mathematical science as it was, and did even more than study Euclid; in his mind he would create new problems, and then sit for hours working them out in figures. Sometimes he has been known to rise from his bed when he could not sleep, and as a relief take his paper and pencil, and work out new geometrical problems, some of which now exist in these manuscripts to be found in his library. Mathematical books and propositions were his delight, and this mathematical turn of mind, doubtless, did its share toward sharpening his keen logic.

And this led him to the physical heavens, for he was also a great lover of astronomy. He gazed at the stars for hours at night, studied their groupings and their courses, and knew them by sight as well as by place and name. The leading ones were often his friendly companions in his nightly walks; and when from his sick bed he could no longer see them, he would inquire after them. "Is Orion bright to-night?" he once asked on a bed made sleepless with pain, as during the day he would say, "Are the winds sounding and the birds singing in the college woods to-day?" This versatility of thought did not desert him till the last. He lived with every earthly beauty, every scientific truth, every religious consolation, while he breathed. As in his library his eye gazed on a thousand instruments of thought, with rich clusters of results in print and manuscript, he seemed anew to drink all in, and revel in the labor of his many years. To jot down the spontaneous thoughts of his busy brain he was in the habit of having near him a multitude of little memorandum books, made just to suit his taste; and one can now follow the journeyings of his mind by running these over page after page. As they lie, apparently worthless little note-books of daily jottings, one

who knows them not would be inclined to pass them over with small notice, whereas they contain the first-fruits of many precious thoughts, afterward worked out into ponderous arguments.

Among the very rare books is a copy of Ulfilas' Gothic Bible, that the doctor prized as the gem of his library, and to these might be added many of great interest to scholars, and especially to bibliophiles. The questions must, of course, rise to all minds, Who shall possess these gems? What shall become of this library, so valuable in itself, and so hallowed by association? Shall it be scattered, or shall it remain intact? Its pecuniary value must be considerable to those whose line of life and thought is like that of its owner, and such a one might well pay generously for it because of its real intrinsic value. But it is more than all this to the surviving family of the great scholar, who as yet feel as if they must keep it intact as he left it—his only legacy.

Dr. Lewis was also a member of the Bible Revision Committee, though he could only add his share by correspondence as it was solicited in difficult cases. Living as he did amid this mass of theological lore, men may wonder that Dr. Lewis was not a professional theologian; indeed, many may be now surprised to learn that he was a simple layman, and not even a doctor of divinity. And, although he long ago received the LL.D. from his *Alma Mater*, and a special degree for classical literature from the Board of Regents of the University of the State, to himself he seemed to remain simple Tayler Lewis; but how grand is this name in its very simplicity, and how infinitely more honorable from what he made it than from what others made it! Many times his friends put to him the question, as did the writer of these lines, "Why have you not taken ministerial orders?" for in his prime his capacities in the pulpit would have been brilliant, with his quickly-working brain, his speaking eye, his sweet, clear, penetrating voice, and, above all, his personal magnetism. To this oft-repeated question he had but one response. "I consider the ministerial office one of such great and solemn responsibility toward God and man that I do not feel myself sanctified to the work; it is too holy, too lofty, for such as I am." And in speaking with him on this subject one could not feel that this was assumed humility; he

seemed in the presence of God's special work to have the deep conviction that he was not purified for it.

But his life was very pure and Christ-like, and with pious resignation he bore his infirmities, and on the bed of pain was resigned to all his sufferings, because he was "so great a sinner," and needed them for his purification. When the sharp pangs would come while on his sick couch, he would say, "These are not so severe as He suffered for me on the cross;" and some of the sweetest utterances of his last days are composed of comparisons between his own pangs and those of the dying Saviour whose blood would wash him white. And this being washed white in red blood was to him an inspired expression: "Just think of it! What person uninspired would speak of being made white by the application of red blood? I have often thought of it, and the Bible is full of such expressions." He endured all his sufferings with the most Christian resignation, and a few weeks before his death, when it was evident that he would soon depart, his daughter said to him, "It will be so hard to part with you." "Yes, it will be hard to part; I shall part with much, but I shall go to much." Another time she said, "The world will not seem very bright to me when I can no longer see you." He answered, "O, my child, where I am going there is eternal brightness."

His religious faith was very simple, and with his mighty reason he depended much less on it than on the divine story of the cross and the revealed word which he has done so very much to verify and make simple even to the child. His was the believing spirit; and it is a beautiful testimony to the truth of the Gospel that this man, who was both scientist and theologian, saw no incongruity between the Scripture story and that of science, and he who knew so fully the physical forces of nature felt still the force of prayer in shaping the beneficence and mercy of God.

And as he was devoted to his God, so he was faithful to his friends and the special interests with which he was identified. He was greatly attached to the college, and loved nothing so well as to roam in contemplation through its groves and across its campus. His special enjoyment was the magnificent sunsets witnessed of a summer evening from the terrace of the latter. He would stand and gaze at the sky long after the

glow of the setting sun had disappeared, and seemed to be lost, as he declared, in the contemplation of the land of Beulah beyond. "How can I leave Union College?" he would often say in his waning days, as if the institution would lose its guardian angel when he should pass away. And the college in return feels the irreparable loss of Tayler Lewis; his fame was so bound up with its history and its works that there is, indeed, a void without him, and one that no man expects to fill. It has been said that when Dr. Lewis died so *much* died—so much learning, so much usefulness, so much influence, so much that took years of hard study to acquire. And thus when he finally left them, though he had not been an active teacher in the work of his chair for some time, the faculty officially acknowledged in their action all that has been said above, the germ of which is in the words: "The scholar, the patriot, the Christian, has departed from among us to receive his reward. *Opus multum, Merces magna.*" And this *Opus multum*—great labor—as Horace Greeley once said of Dr. Lewis, will be better appreciated by the world at large after his death than while living. The depth of his studies and the magnitude of his aims can be comprehended now that we are inclined to look upon his labor as finished, though in reality it is destined to live very long after him. In his last years he declined to leave his home for public duties, and thus he simply presented to the Christian Alliance a paper on "The Unity of the Churches," a subject in which he took much interest. He would sometimes endeavor to attend the University convocation at Albany, and only with the greatest misgiving did he finally accept the flattering invitation to deliver one series of the "Vedder Lectures" before the faculty and students of Rutgers' College. This last public effort did him great credit; but he nerved himself to the task of travel and exertion in performing this trust with great misgivings, feeling that his feeble body would not stand the strain. But the careful companionship and attention of his wife brought him successfully through a duty the faithful performance of which he looked back to with much pleasure.

Dr. Lewis was seventy-five years of age when he died, and all the labor of his later years was produced in the midst of pain and disabilities that would have discouraged and baffled

most men. But even the distressing pains of sciatica could not entirely prohibit him from working, for with all the weakness of his body his great brain remained strong and clear; it was seemingly iron-clad, and when struck resounded with the clearest tones. Even in his last hours his thoughts were not vague, but clear and defined, so that he recognized the members of his family to the very last, and in intervals of relief from pain conversed, until his breath became a dying gasp.

We can easily imagine that the readers of this sketch will say that it is the work of the panegyrist, notwithstanding the fact that the writer has frequently restrained his pen for fear that its accents savored too much of eulogy. But he feels more than borne out in much that he has said when listening to the criticisms of others better able than he to appreciate the real depth and merit of the principal works of Dr. Lewis. Read, for instance, the following mere paragraph of a long criticism of one who studied the sage more than most of his admirers:—

It is deeply to be regretted that the reception given to his volume on Plato—a volume too profound to be at once appreciated, too earnestly and skillfully opposed to our cherished rationalism to be warmly welcomed—was not such as to have compelled him to have given to his country the honor of the noblest exposition of the works of Plato that the world has ever seen. . . . In his volume on Plato he promises another if that work shall be acceptable to the public. Similar intimations may be found in each of the volumes he has published. But none of these works ever appeared. We sympathize with this lone thinker in great solitudes of thought, craving a little of that human sympathy which gives wings to genius and steals from time its weight. . . . The literary world has a sort of unity, but there is little unity in the scholastic and religious world. Lewis' writings, though purely scholastic, though so scholastic in their spirit as hardly to disclose to what faith he belongs, are intensely religious—more so even on scholastic and social topics than those of some divines on sacred subjects. Had he identified himself more with some one sect, and less with the Christianity common to them all, or had his zeal been less uncompromising, less ardent, less holy, his fame would have been easier and wider. . . . The years Lewis has given to his volume on creation might have produced an exposition of Platonism such as the scholastic world has vainly waited for for ages; but the volume he has written disposes of a question compared with which these debated in the schools are insignificant. We have spoken of its discoveries. We add a few words as to its literary character. Finer English has not been written. As

an argument it is a wonder of sustained power. Its tone is that of a soul which sees clearly into things mysterious, and is awed and exalted by what it sees. It is a poem in prose. The grand emotions it awakens make it a fitting comment on the wonderful vision of the creative ages. Its perfection as a work of art is not through art. Unconsciously in the mirror of his style the writer's soul is reflected.

And thus we might quote for pages, did space permit and need call for it. And still we feel it our duty to say that Dr. Lewis had his critics, who declared that much that he wrote was philosophy rather than science, and speculation rather than fact; who declared the characteristics of all his arguments to be subtilty and speculation; who acknowledge the brilliancy of his thoughts, but who question the soundness of his judgment; and who, while granting his marvelous knowledge of classic and Oriental tongues, declared that but measured confidence was to be placed in his attempts to explain the Hebrew from other tongues, cognate or not cognate.

But those who spoke thus were very few, and the testimony of classical and biblical scholars is well nigh unanimous in his favor. Thousands of Christian teachers and theological writers throughout the country regard his name with great reverence, and find in him one worthy to lead them through the story of revelation. And here we think it fitting to refer to a friendship that existed between Dr. Lewis and the editor of this "Quarterly," that was more than fraternal; and still in the flesh they had never met; it was the sympathy of kindred spirits walking in kindred paths that bound them so closely together that whatever the one wrote the other was sure to read, and, we may say, admire. For many years an occasional correspondence was maintained between them, and the pages of the "Quarterly" were ever open to all that Dr. Lewis might contribute to them. It was the sorrow rather than the fault of both that these missives were not more frequent. In the later years of Dr. Lewis' life it was the province of the writer of this sketch to be the messgae-bearer between the two on his occasional visits to New York, so that in the latter city he seldom failed to be burdened with some words from Dr. Lewis, and found the load seldom lightened on his return trip.

But we are admonished to hasten to close this article, that its length may not transcend the limits granted in these pages; and we prefer to do it at the bedside of our dying friend. We were preparing for a lengthened absence from our home, and chose an hour wherein to say farewell to one whom we knew we could not find here on our return. And that hour was very sad, though precious in its sadness because of its Christian teachings. With our hand placed in his he recounted many of the experiences that we had passed through together, and alluded to the gratifying fact that no frown had ruffled the surface of our intercourse. He spoke of his continued confidence in the religion of Christ, and remarked that he bore his own acute and lingering pain with greater resignation because Christ had suffered so much more for him. He had perfect confidence in the atoning blood of the Saviour, notwithstanding his neglected opportunities.

Dr. Lewis was a member of the Reformed Church, but he was always kindly disposed toward Methodism, and watched all its movements as a member of the Christian family. He liked the earnest character of its religious life, and its aggressive mission work, and was in his younger days very fond of our revival hymns. "O," said he then, "that I could hear some of your sweet Methodist hymns before I go!" He would have gone more exultantly to heaven could he have heard the hymns and the birds. Then, turning to the wall, he called my attention to some Scripture texts there hanging that whiled away some of his weary hours; and to these I soon added one from our Book Room, having also some of the old-fashioned Methodist hymns at the bottom of each page. As I parted from him—alas, to see him no more!—I knew that he could not hear my farewell, and I could not bear to write one; so with tearful eyes I impressed a kiss of Christian and fraternal love on his noble brow, while he pressed my hand with increased fervor. Soon after that he went where he can hear the songs of the angels, though his ears were deaf to heavenly melodies on earth.

When he died many hearts were broken, and a gloom pervaded the institution and the town, which soon extended far beyond these. The hearts of thousands of his friends and pupils throughout the land mourned the loss of one whose influence

had penetrated throughout Christendom, and those in his immediate surroundings all felt as if a friend had gone and left a great void.

Many of these hastened from distant points to be present at his funeral obsequies, and crowded in sorrow around his bier. To one of his pupils, a Presbyterian divine, was allotted the task of speaking for his fellows these last words of love and reverence before his cold form:—

> It would seem more becoming for us at this hour to stand before the honored dead, as in days gone by we have stood before the living, with our own lips sealed, and let him grandly speak to us, for the power of faith giveth endless life, and "by it he, being dead, yet speaketh."
>
> Surely this is no time or place for eulogy. It would be treason to a man who walked softly before his Maker, and who loved to repeat those lines, familiar by association with another cherished name:—
>
> "O why should the spirit of mortal be proud?"
>
> We find little temptation to indulge in panegyric, for the things that excite the world's admiration are not the things which fill our thoughts and our hearts. It is not to the scholar, whose loss two hemispheres deplore, that we bring our tribute to-day; it is to the man and the Christian, the friend, the instructor, the inspirer of our lives; and we are here to bury, not to praise him. And yet, standing before his fellow-citizens, who have loved and honored him, under the shadow of the college which has so long borrowed luster from his name, surrounded by his co-laborers in the fields of science and philosophy, by young men who felt the inspiration of his genius, and learned to venerate his fragile form, may I not allude to the crowning trait of his character and life? This is now his glory and his greatness, that above all other loves he loved and feared his God. . . . In this age of irreverence and clamorous doubt we need the testimony of one who explored so widely the domain of truth, and came back to lay his dying hand on the word of God, and say, "It is all light here." . . . He no longer needs that utterance of human need and Christian faith—the last that I heard from his lips—"Pray for me." . . . The words of the man of Uz, with whom our honored friend held such high converse, and whom he so grandly interpreted, come very sweetly to our ears as we commit his mortal remains to their resting place: "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

As his coffin was lowered into the grave a simple service was repeated, and the college choir sang, "I would not live alway," and the pall-bearers deposited flowers upon it. Then

came the students and faculty and family, with their tributes of flowers, until these covered the casket that contained his precious remains. And thus they left him, to sleep in a quiet vale, where all in nature is beautiful, and where the birds will sing their requiems over his tomb, while he is called to enjoy a higher existence and hear diviner songs at the throne of Him whom he so grandly interpreted.

And still one more testimonial came to his memory on the Sabbath evening of commencement week, which was made a memorial occasion by a sermon from the president of the college on the favorite text of Dr. Lewis: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." His life was presented to the students as a noble incentive to go forward and meet the future with a firm heart, trusting in Christ's guidance, that they might die as he died, in the firmest hope of a glorious resurrection.

## ART. III.—THE NEW ETHICS.

*System der Ethik.* Dargestellt von Dr. WILHELM KAULICH, Professor der Philosophie an der Universität zu Graz. Pp. 505. Prague: F. Tempsky. 1877.

ETHICS in its true form is of very recent origin. It is true, the Greeks and Romans had what was called a science of ethics. But this was little more than a summary of practical maxims of strictly empirical character. A solid logical basis was entirely lacking. In the mediæval Christian age the field of ethics was properly regarded as a department of theology in general, while theology itself was identified with philosophy. At the Reformation this identification was broken up, and the scientific world was divided into two relatively hostile streams, the one theological, and the other purely secular. The one stream emphasized God and historical revelation, to the neglect of nature and conscience; the other magnified reason and nature, and left God and the Bible out of the account. The science of ethics fell to the secular stream, and the endeavor was made to construct a science of morality while yet ignoring the very foundations of that science. The result was that jejune affair which has so long been taught in some of our colleges under

the varying appellations of moral science, ethics, moral philosophy, etc. But recent Christian thought is fast remedying this blunder. A new ethics is being created; the science is being reconstructed, transformed, and rendered thoroughly self-consistent and Christian. Harless, Palmer, Rothe, Culmann, Calderwood, Wuttke, Gregory, have rendered great service in this direction. The latter three are among the very best works accessible to English readers.

The science of ethics as created and constructed by these men is of thoroughly Christian character. It bases the moral life upon God. It gives to conscience its true supernatural character. It gives an intelligible conception of right and wrong. It safeguards human freedom. It sets up as the goal of life the true ideal of Christian perfection. It is become a twin sister of theology, as theology itself is become an integral part of philosophy in general.

To the Arminian public it is a pleasing thought that this new ethics is based upon thoroughly Arminian principles. Creatural freedom, in the sense of discretionary ability to choose between opposite courses, and even to prefer a weaker to a stronger motive, is its very life-breath. Infringe upon this liberty, or bind up man's life in the decrees of God, and there is no longer any more possibility of morality in man than of holiness in a stone.

One of the freshest and ablest presentations of the new ethics is that of Dr. Kaulich, of the University of Grätz. We have read this work with unmingled delight. It is pleasing to find in this remote seat of learning substantially the same views of the moral life as are taught in our own Arminian schools of Evanston, Drew, and Boston.

It is our purpose in the rest of this paper to give a brief outline of some of the leading positions of Dr. Kaulich. His work, of 505 pages, consists of two equal parts, the first philosophical, the second practical. For the sake of brevity we shall let the author speak mostly in his own person. He says: Ethics sets before man a life of duties, by the fulfilling of which he is to attain to his true destination. But as man's duties are limited by his abilities, our first inquiry must be as to what are these abilities.

Popularly, man is said to consist of body and soul. But

this much is true, also, of brutes. And as man has generic differences from the brute—for example, conscience—hence we must regard him as consisting of more than body and soul. The brute receives impressions from external objects, but he gives no proof of ability to combine these impressions into generalizations. The brute gives no evidence of ability to interrupt the chain of his impressions, and to select others in their stead. But man can do both. Hence man has something which is lacking to the brute. We shall call it spirit. Hence we say, man consists of body, soul, and spirit.

How, now, are body, soul, and spirit related to each other? The body is a material form. The spirit must be essentially different: it is the seat of self-consciousness. In self-consciousness we refer impressions to our *self* as subject, and we bring past and present impressions into unity. Self-consciousness implies, therefore, the unchangeable reality and the active causality of our *self*. Hence we conclude that our self or spirit (which is the basis of self-consciousness) is a real, simple, free, causative essence, while our body is a composite, material, unfree form. In respect to his body man is rooted in the general system of nature, and is in so far subject to mechanical and necessary law. But in virtue of his spirit he is superior to nature and to natural law, and is an individual member of another world—the world of reason, in which prevails a law of reason, which law he *should* obey, but *can* violate. But the relation of body and soul is essentially different from that of body and spirit. The soul manifests no phenomena in which the body does not share. Hence we must regard it as only a higher phase of nature itself. It and the body constitute but a single individuality. Man consists, therefore, of a vital unity of a somatic soul and a spirit, the latter being the fundamental factor, and the former its actual seat and condition. The unity of body, soul, and spirit constitutes man a spiritual person.

How, now, is this person related to the law of causality? In order to answer this we must first settle two questions: Are spirit and nature conditioned or unconditioned objects? What is the nature of the union of spirit and nature? These questions are easily settled. All observation, all history, proves that the human spirit, in order to be spirit at all, needs the

help of other spirits. The infant has not the actuality, but only the potentiality, of a spirit. Left without the care, the influence, of others, it does not rise out of the sphere of mere animal life. The spirit is, therefore, a conditioned object. And as the natural part of man, the body, is subordinate to the spirit, we must conclude that it also is dependent. Now, as that which is conditioned implies necessarily that which is unconditioned, hence we are forced to ascribe reality to the idea of God. But also the union of nature and spirit in man implies the reality of a divine cause. For nature could not force the spirit to unite with it; nor could the spirit force nature, seeing that the development of the spirit is itself dependent on external influences. The union of spirit and nature must, therefore, have been effected by an external cause which is lord over nature and spirit, that is, by God himself.

Man is, therefore, a creature of God. And as every creature furnishes some evidence of the nature of God, so man, by his high endowments, does so in a very high degree. Man is an image, a reflex, of God. Hence man's nature forms a favorable starting-point for inferring the nature of God. Now, man is free; hence God is free. Man acts toward an end; he has a purpose; hence God also acts for an end. Hence in creating man God had a purpose. This purpose must be either that man should *be* something, or that he should *become* something, or both. Consciousness and experience force us to the conclusion that it is both. Consciousness also indicates that the prime characteristic of man is freedom. It is in virtue of freedom that man is able to reach his goal, and that the reaching of this goal can be placed before man as a duty. In order, therefore, to a true comprehension of the nature of man, and of his life-task, it is, first of all, essential that we get a true conception of human freedom.

Let us attempt this. And first, what is the relation of thought to volition? It is plain that the will goes out to no object without this object having been first *in* our thoughts. Hence the contents of our thoughts may be said to influence volition. And these contents, even when partially forgotten, have also some influence. But this influence cannot be regarded as causative in an efficient sense, otherwise the very

essence of freedom would be sacrificed. We must, therefore, insist that the will is relatively independent of our thoughts. The objects of thought do not *determine* our volitions. The volitionating subject is able to select among the objects before his mind, and to make any one of them, to the exclusion of all the others, the goal of his efforts. Preliminarily, therefore, we may define freedom as that power whereby a creature absolutely selects for himself the goal of his endeavors.

Here we must distinguish between *absolute* and *relative* freedom. The selected goal of action may either be *created* by the subject who chooses it, or it may be simply *elected*. The former is absolute freedom, and belongs to God alone; the latter is relative freedom, and belongs to the creature. Man, in fact, selects his goal from among the realistically *given* relations and objects by which he finds himself surrounded. The relative freedom of the creature is further limited by the ability of the subject. The creatural will *might* select a goal which it is essentially unable to reach.

Further, as every free creature stands by virtue of its creation in definite relations to God and its fellow-creatures, and as every activity of the creature produces some change in itself, hence the creature is able by its freedom to put itself into a different attitude toward God and the world. It is, therefore, not bound or forced by any inner necessity. And, on the other hand, as also the external objects of thought do not causatively determine its volitions, hence the free creature is superior both to internal and to external constraint.

Nor is it enough to declare that moral freedom consists in the ability constantly to will the good, so that only he should be regarded as truly free who uniformly wills the good, and labors toward its realization. Freedom consists not simply in the ability to act in *one* direction, but also in the opposite direction. The free creature can just as really will and do the evil as the good, for it has the ability *arbitrarily* to select the goal of its endeavors from *any* of the objects which present themselves to its senses or its imagination. The power of free choice is, therefore, the ultimate cause of the selection and pursuit of whatever life-course the creature actually enters upon. *The logical admission of moral freedom involves, therefore, the admission of an absolutely new beginning.*

And solely because the free creature is an ultimate cause can the responsibility for its acts be thrown upon *it*, and not upon its Creator. The responsibility cannot be thrown upon God, for the simple reason that the original nature of the creature was so constituted as that the creature by that simple fact *was* a first cause of courses of action. God is, therefore, in no sense whatever responsible for the choices of the free creature. Hence appears at once the absurdity of saying that God ought not to have created *such* beings as he foresaw would abuse their liberty; for this would really preclude the creation of any free beings at all, since it follows from the very idea of a free being that nothing outside of its own self can assure its not sinning.

The correctness of this view is amply illustrated by the practice of civil justice, which holds the *person himself* responsible for his acts, as also by our conscience, which condemns, not God, but *us*, for our sins.

We may further define the nature of freedom thus: Every phenomenon of a substance is a revelation of an essential element in that substance. Now, some of the phenomena of a free creature relate to the ontological essence of the creature, and may, therefore, be called ontological. Others relate to the selecting of ends, and hence may be called teleological. The former class lie outside of the sphere of freedom; they take place with the same kind of necessity whereby a seed reproduces its own kind. Freedom is, therefore, confined to the latter class. Hence we may additionally define freedom as that quality of the essence of a moral creature by virtue of which it is capable of being the first cause of the teleological phase of its acts and life.

Now, as the true teleological drift of a moral creature's life consists in the pursuit of perfection through love to God and man, hence we are entitled to hold that the free creature is able to *be* the final, the real, cause of this teleological consummation. And it is precisely in this ability that lies the great likeness of man to God. The free creature is called by God to be a co-creator of its own perfection, seeing that it is called to freely realize its own ideal. And as the perfecting of a single creature is a contribution to the perfection of the universe, hence we may say that the rational free creature is

called to be a co-creator not only of itself, but also of the entire cosmos.

In virtue of its freedom, accordingly, the moral creature is able to seek its perfection and bliss by striving to enter into harmony with other creatures and with God; and the actual success of such striving will depend upon how correctly the creature conforms to the objective conditions of its existence. In any case, however, it is itself the founder of its own fruition and perfection, or their opposite.

The conception of moral freedom thus attained entitles us to further inferences. And, firstly, in respect to personal identity. If freedom implies that we are the actual cause of our life-course, then it implies the sameness of this cause in our successive actions, seeing that the life-course is itself a unit. Freedom is, in fact, simply the continuous expression of the unity and sameness of the moral actor in his relations to other beings. Again: the subject, in virtue of self-consciousness, knows himself as a reality, not as a cause; but this would be impossible in the absence of real freedom. For if freedom were lacking, then the process of thought would be of the character of necessity, and the subject would not be conscious of an ability to break in upon it, and direct his attention to one train of thought to the exclusion of others. The consciousness of being a cause involves, therefore, the *reality* of freedom. Hence, if freedom were not a fact, then there could be no possible ground for the thought of causation. Self-consciousness and freedom are, therefore, the mutual conditions of each other. Hence a self-conscious being is necessarily a free one; and a free one is necessarily a self-conscious one.

The freedom of the creature is at first an absolute, discretionary power to choose between different courses of life. But it cannot possibly remain in this condition of indifference. For the effect of the very first teleological choice is to impress a *degree* of character upon the actor. In consequence of this first decision, therefore, any subsequent decision in the same direction is rendered more easy than the first. And at the goal of the teleological development, that is, at the full attainment of the two solely possible courses of development—that toward God, and that toward evil—the determination of

character becomes so definite and positive as to exclude the possibility of a choice between moral opposites. That is to say, our *discretionary* freedom rises through the development of character to the stage of *moral* freedom. This stage of freedom has in one sense the character of necessity. By virtue of the perfectness of the character the free being *will* always will in rational harmony with its moral character. The necessity is, therefore, moral, and not mechanical.

Accordingly, it is the free being himself who is the efficient cause of his own maturity in good or maturity in evil. And any system of theology which should place this efficient cause in any thing else than the creature, as, for example, in the abundance of divine grace with the righteous, and in its lack with the sinner, would be not only philosophically absurd, but also blasphemously immoral, for it would make God, and not man, responsible for the moral differences between good and bad men. For whatever system makes God the efficient cause of the moral good in good men, logically implies that he is also the efficient cause of the moral evil in bad men.

From the fact that the free actions of the rational creature are affected both by the selected object of action and by the objective nature of the subject and his relations to other beings, it follows that the life of a rational creature will be free from antagonism with other beings only when it flows in harmony with, and respects the objective relations of, other existences. Now, these objective relations are the expression of the divine creative action and will, and are hence a revelation of the teleological destination of the creature. Hence it is through the divine will that both the goal of man is placed before him, and also the limits are fixed within which his free actions can freely attain to that goal. As soon as the free being awakens to a true consciousness of itself, it must also become conscious of this obligatory goal of its life, and it can refer the external will which confronts it in the relations of its existence to no other being than to that First Cause to which the finiteness of its own nature forces it to attribute its own creation. With the same necessity, therefore, by which it is forced to attribute its own existence to the divine will, it is also forced to accept the teleological significance of its objective condition and relations as the direct and *bin ing* expression of the divine will.

To the mind of the rational creature there are present, therefore, these two thoughts: (1.) The dependence of the creature for its existence and for the true goal of its life upon God; and, (2,) the subjective freedom of the creature in the face of this life-goal. Its goal is *before* it; its freedom is *within* it. The two things confront each other, and furnish the possibility of an antagonism. For by virtue of its freedom the creature *may* choose to exercise its freedom otherwise than in affirming its objective relations. It may will to will the attainment of the God-set goal, *or* it may will to will arbitrarily, and hence sinfully.

But the recognized dependence of the creature on God furnishes ample reason why the creature should regard the fulfilling of its objective relations as a higher goal than the asserting of its ability to volitionate arbitrarily and selfishly. And to this higher goal the moral consciousness gives its emphatic affirmation. Furthermore, when the creature wills to fulfill not its own arbitrary will, but God's will, and when it, as a result, comes into communion with God and all that is godlike, the necessary consequence is complete harmony of existence, both inner and outer. This harmony of nature is *truthfulness.* The means of effecting it is voluntary self-subordination to God's will, that is, it is *humility.* And humility in action is *obedience.* And the sole influential motive to this giving up of one's own arbitrary will for God's will can only be our desire to become a realized idea of God; that is, to become an object of absolute worth, and hence a witness to God's power and goodness in view of honoring God. In a single word, our influencing motive can be simply *love* to God. And the development of these four cardinal virtues to their full maturity constitutes the state of moral perfection, and leads to the exaltation of our arbitrary freedom from the state of being able to choose the evil into a state in which it is no longer morally possible for us to choose any thing but the good.

For the result of active obedience to God is *permanence of character like God.* From this harmony of character with God ensue directly both peace and bliss. And this bliss will unquestionably flow largely from our consciousness of having, by a right use of our freedom, been a co-worker with God both in our own perfection and in the perfecting of the cosmos.

And with the full development of our character like God will also be enlarged our intellectual horizon. So that ultimately faith will be swallowed up in sight: believing and seeing and knowing will be but one. And this absolute correctness of knowledge will be an additional reason, over and above the fixedness of our character, why we never shall by any rational possibility fall away from the good.

But when, on the contrary, the rational creature makes its own individual will the chief thing, when it makes its own independence upon God its chief motive, when it undertakes, apart from God, to be the first cause of its own happiness, then the harmony of existence is radically disturbed, both subjectively and objectively. The consequent attitude of the creature is necessarily a false one; for its subjective endeavor is in contradiction to its objective creative idea. While objectively planned for God, the creature ignores this relation, and makes its whole course of life a self-deception and a lie. It undertakes to be equal to God, and to suffice for its own bliss. Thereby it radically darkens its own judgment and reason. Its self-delusion gives birth to *pride*. It revolts against God. And because in this revolt it meets with obstacles, and is defeated in its clash with its objective divinely established surroundings, hence it is filled with *hate* against God. In the blindness of this unhappiness and hate it is unwilling to locate its misfortune in its true source, namely, its own revolt against reason and God, but it attributes it to its objective environment; hence it hates both God and all that is like God.

The collective state of the rebellious creature is expressed in the one word selfishness. And selfishness leads to all social disorder. In its effort to create its own happiness it enters into relations with other creatures. But its motive is not real love. It does not love its fellows in God, but only as means to its own happiness. It aims to subordinate others to itself. It becomes a tyrant, an oppressor. The result is injustice and all unrighteousness. And the consequence is, that the creature falls into antagonism to its own self, to God, and to the universe. And the constant consciousness of this antagonism is the foundation of the sinner's wretchedness. The progress of revolt against God leads to definitive and irremediable diabolicity of character. It is the left-hand goal of moral action,

even as the impeccable condition of the perfected saint is the right-hand goal. And, by the inherent nature of things, all moral beings must, sooner or later, land in one of these goals.

What we have thus far said relates to freedom simply in a general way. But how stands the matter when we come to examine empirical man as we find him in experience? Our general position is, that both in the theoretical and in the practical fields the reality of freedom of choice between opposites is an unquestionable *fact*. What, now, are the reasons that force us to accept this fact? In order to an answer let us analyze an action, say, a free action directed toward an outer object. Here, obviously, the muscles must be employed. This implies an exertion of force. And this exertion is in view of a more or less clear conception of the object. Without this conception there would be no exertion toward the object, no outgoing of will. The exertion of the will and the exertion of the force are but phases of the same thing. Both take place in view of the object. But the idea of the object is not the action of the will; nor does this idea, nor any combination of ideas, directly generate an action of the will. Still, they stand in close relation to the action of the will; they furnish the occasion in view of which the will puts forth its action. They do not directly *cause* the will to act; otherwise the action were a mere mechanism, and there were no play-room for freedom. Just here lies the difference between man and the brute. The brute gives no evidence of ability to resist the force of motives. Hence we call it unfree. It follows uniformly the attraction of its impressions. But man is able to turn his attention away from one train of impressions and to another. He can interrupt the attractive force of tempting objects. Thereby he can bring himself to will a lower instead of a higher, a smaller instead of a greater, object. This power of turning the attention is an expression of man's spiritual power. Thereby he shows himself a supernatural being; that is, he is able to resist the attraction of external objects. Thus, freedom may be said to be that power of a rational spirit whereby it is able to be to itself the cause of its own actions, independently of outer influences.

But though independent of *outer* influences, may not the action of the will be dependent upon *inner* influences? Do not

our recollected impressions determine the particular course to which we turn our attention? Also here the voice of consciousness answers in the negative. We are able not only to resist one current of recollected impressions and turn to another, but we are able at discretion to generate a fresh combination even of pure imaginations, and to follow these in preference to real impressions. Freedom, therefore, consists in an independence both of outer and of inner impressions and motives. It is the ability to select at discretion any or every, real or imaginary, object of pursuit.

But the independence of the free spirit goes still further. An object may tempt our power of action, and yet the action itself not follow. All conceivable objects may tempt, and yet the will be absolutely inactive. No action *need* take place. The action takes place only when the spirit consents.

From this it follows that all outward voluntary activity rests upon inner freedom, without which such action were inconceivable. This inner freedom is one of the very clearest facts of the general consciousness. However much, therefore, man may be limited by circumstances, by his physical ability, his relations to the world, etc., he is yet inwardly free, and by this freedom he is as much distinguished from the brute as by self-consciousness and by speculative thought.

As sensuous perception is connected with voluntary desire, so is also all volitional action connected with thought. In fact, thought is the very first field in which freedom manifests itself. Thinking is a voluntary exercise. Its characteristic is the ability of affirmation and negation. Every object which presents itself to thought may be accepted or dismissed. Herein consists the power of turning the attention. By confining the attention to one train of connected impressions or ideas, we are able to discover the causal relation of objects. This gives rise to knowledge, for knowledge consists in the perceived relations of ideas and things. The impressions of objects are objectively *forced* upon us; the ordering of these single impressions into generic relations is the voluntary work of the will. These relations are discoverable only by turning the attention forward and backward along a chain of objects; but this calls for freedom in the power that directs the attention. Thus we find a new confirmation of man's freedom in his

ability to break through, or resist, or resume again, a chain of successive impressions or ideas. For if we did not possess this power, then we should be the absolute slaves of the law of association of ideas. Then the strongest impressions would dynamically seize and absolutely hold our attention. We should be as passive as the crystal in receiving and transmitting the light. We should simply receive the first impressions that came; but we could not dismiss them, or select them, or call up others in their place. But as we *can* do this, we infer that we *are* free.

But the clearest proof of our real freedom lies in our direct consciousness. We attribute our actions to *ourselves*, as their *cause*. Upon this is based all punishment, all repentance, all remorse.

But the freedom of man is not creative, but only *creatural* freedom. For man does not objectively posit the goal of his endeavor, but he selects it from among objects that are objectively given. Nor do we act without the occasioning interest of some objectively given consideration, though we are free to follow a higher or a lower interest. Nor do we, further, volitionate effectively save in so far as we act in reference to the objective realities of the world about us. In all these three respects, therefore, our freedom, though essential and real, is yet different from the freedom of God. It is creatural freedom.

God's freedom is absolute and self-sufficient. It is confronted with no object of desire outside of itself. It does not have to reconcile itself with reason; for it is, *per se*, essentially at one with absolute wisdom and holiness. In the absolute goodness of the actuality of the divine will it is transcendent above all the limitations which necessarily characterize all creatural freedom.

The conditionality of human freedom is very manifest in the failure of many of its endeavors. It may, for example, undertake a task beyond human strength. It may select wrong means to reach its end. It may be thwarted by the unforeseen opposition of other free wills. Thus the limitations of human freedom are in strict accord with the limitations of human nature in general.

We now pass to another phase of the discussion of freedom. It is clear that the ideal state of man would be that in which

every individual should uniformly will in harmony with his ideal. But this is far from the actual fact. On the contrary, we uniformly observe a tendency to go astray from this ideal. This is seen in individuals, in families, in nations, in the race. And even with the best of men there is occasional wavering. The clear inference from this is, that man is at present in an abnormal condition. The sole solution of this riddle is found in the facts of the fall of man and in redemption.

But how is the fall of man to be understood? Basing ourselves upon the revealed *fact*, it can be construed only as follows: Man at creation was *good*, not ethically or morally, but *naturally* good. But by his very idea he stood under the immediate necessity of rising from a natural to a moral state, be it good or bad; for he could not act without using his freedom, and he had to use this freedom either in harmony or in disharmony with his true goal of life. In whichever way he started out he would at once, by the very fact of his decision, impress upon his whole being a state of decisiveness which would be determinative of his entire future life-course and character. The actual event proved to be the abnormal choice and the abnormal character. By the fact of his sinful choice the head of the race impressed upon human nature in general a determination to evil. This determination is of the nature of a bent, or proclivity, or proneness, or habituation, or character, of so decisive a nature as to render it infinitely improbable that he who once has it will ever succeed in his own strength in shuffling it off, or even in resisting its downward tendency. With the person who first generated this character in himself, it had the *two*fold nature of personal guilt, and an objective enslavement of his higher powers to his lower ones. That is, he was both guilty, and he was a slave to the mere psychic phase of his being—to appetite, to passion, and to objective nature. But with the posterity of this first sinful man it had only *one* of these elements. It was no longer guilt, but only an objective enslavement to downward tendencies. The descendants of Adam were not guilty of depravity, but they *were* depraved. That depravity was not their work, but it was forced upon them by others. Nevertheless, it was a fearful fact. And by that simple fact they stood at the very first moment of their personal existence under a dire inevitability of consenting

to this depravity, and thus stamping their *natal misfortune* with the character of *personal guilt.*

The necessary counterpart of this inherited depravity is a freely furnished redemption. The necessary correlate of the depravity that is *put upon us* from without is furnished by a redemption that is freely put within our grasp. Apart from a freely offered redemption, a just Creator would not, could not, have permitted the propagation of the human race. And the effect of redemption is simply to produce an equilibrium against the downward tendency of depravity. So that in virtue of freely offered and urged redemption, the children of Adam, though depraved, are yet, *all of them*, enabled, 1, triumphantly to resist sin, and, 2, freely to elect that course of life which will eventuate in generating within the soul a perfectly holy character; and hence, 3, in finally eliminating the last vestiges of depravity from its nature, as also, 4, in giving to its nature such a drift toward God and all good as will effectually preclude the practicability of falling again into evil.

It is solely in this doctrine of the correlation of depravity and redemption that the so-called riddles and enigmas of human life are explicable. And the key to every rational explanation is the recognition of the true nature of creatural freedom, namely, as the ability to select, at discretion, a lower instead of a higher, or a higher instead of a lower, good. For it is perfectly easy to see how that man, having such liberty, should and does lead the partially good or bad, the inconsistent and imperfect life, which is too often presented in society.

Such is a meager abstract of Dr. Kaulich's elaborate discussion of the nature of creatural freedom. Of other features of his system we have space for but very brief notice.

What the nature of the moral law is in Kaulich's system might be easily inferred from what we have already said. In this point, as in most others, he is essentially in harmony with Wuttke and Gregory. He holds that the moral law is simply the formulated expression of the nature of man and of his relations; in other words, it is a reflex of the creative purpose of God in constituting man as man. And this is the same as saying that it is the expression of the divine will. Right is, therefore, conformity to the will of God. And the old puzzle: Is a thing right because God wills it, or does God will it because

it is right? loses all its force. Both alternates are true when properly guarded. By the very making of moral creatures God establishes relations between himself and his creatures; and the observing of these relations is to do right. But why he made these relations such as they are lies exclusively in divine reason as expressed in the creative will.

And the great question as to the moral motive is now very readily settled. A motive is the end we aim at in moral action. There are various ends which we may select, such as sensual pleasure, unrighteous power, selfish self-exaltation, or ideal moral perfection, some of them in conflict with the ideal goal of life, and only one of them in harmony with it. Which motive is the binding one? Evidently only the latter, namely, the pursuit of ideal moral perfection.

But what is included in this pursuit? And what are the conditions of its attainment? One answer will meet both questions, namely, a conforming of our lives to the objective facts of the universe. Now, what are these facts? They are these: That there is an infinite personal rational Being, the Creator of all things; that whatever he makes is good, and whatever he does is right; that because of God's infinite wisdom, whatever he makes is made for a purpose; and that, consequently, every single object in the universe has a right to exist for its particular purpose, and no other object has a right to infringe upon it. A conformity to the objective facts of the universe, consequently, would include this: That each rational being recognizes its dependence upon God, respects the rights of all other creatures of God, and freely accepts, with the heart, its life-goal, or task, as expressed by the facts of its nature. And as the facts of its nature further imply that the moral creature is, by the very nature of morality, called to be a co-worker with God in the full maturing of its ideal character, as, also, in the up-building of its brother-creatures, hence, the conforming of our lives to the objective facts of the universe, in other words, the seeking of our ideal moral perfection, consists in submissively devoting ourselves to God. But devotion to God includes devotion to his person, and devotion to all the creatures of God, to the measure of our ability. This, then, is *the* moral motive—unselfishly to devote ourselves to God and to all the creatures or works of God.

Now, *among* these creatures or works of God is the personal self of the moral agent. Does the moral motive permit the moral agent to have respect to his own personal good? Is he not required to be *absolutely disinterested?* The properly guarded answer to this question will furnish the rational mid-course between two erroneous extremes which have, turn by turn, corrupted the fundamental principle of ethics ever since ethics has claimed to be a science.

How shall we answer it? Dr. Kaulich gives the properly guarded answer. It is thus: Man is under obligation to love God and all God's works. He himself is a work of God, therefore he is obliged to love himself. It would be as wrong for him to not love his neighbor as to not love himself. But this love to self must correspond to the objective facts of the universe. It must keep within proper bounds; that is, it must be truthful. It must observe a proper proportion. Man and his neighbor are absolutely equal. Therefore a man must love himself *as* his neighbor, not more and not less; and he must love his neighbor as himself, not more and not less. This is the golden formula. This is the antidote, on the one hand, to the impossible, transcendent, unrational, pretended disinterestedness of the ethics of Kant, and, on the other, to the flat eudemonistic ethics of the utilitarian school. Man has not a right to aim exclusively at personal happiness, but he also has no right to ignore that happiness. He is under a categorical imperative to realize his own ideal. This ideal consists in a holy character, which loves God and all that is God's. The subjective fruit of this character is bliss, happiness. And the constitution of the world is such that this happiness vanishes just so soon as it is made a *direct* object of *main* pursuit. It is a *fruit* of a God-consecrated life. But it is a foreknown fruit: he who loves God and his neighbor *knows* that he is on the way to personal happiness. If he were even to try to do so, he could not shut this fact out of his knowledge. But may he act in reference to it? He may not act in reference to it exclusively. But he should and must act in reference to the *whole* truth; and a *part* of the truth is, that a godly life *procures* happiness. He may and ought to act in reference to the whole truth of his life and destiny. It is, therefore, only a half-truth to say that man's morality is worthless unless it be

wholly disinterested; as it is, also, only a half-truth to say that the end of the moral life is personal happiness. Put the two half-truths together, and we have the whole truth. Man is to lead such a life as will, in fact, result in the greatest happiness to the greatest number, but he himself is, and must be, one of this number. Man may have respect unto the rewards of virtue, without yet in the least tarnishing that virtue. Man may aim at personal happiness, but only as a *part* of his generic aim to be an ideal child of God. Thus guarded, this aim will never turn into selfishness, and will never collide with the happiness of others; for it will be but a part of the whole, and the whole will be an aim to love God with undivided heart, and to produce the greatest good to the whole circle of God's creatures.

Such are a few of the fundamental principles upon which this elaborate system of ethics is based. And the superstructure corresponds with the foundations. The practical part of the book is especially replete with rich wisdom, and with an abundance of concrete examples from life. It is especially gratifying to us, Arminians, to meet with such a thorough indorsement and defense of the freedom of the will from one who is not of our theological school. We heartily commend the work to all students of ethics.

## Art. IV.—PLAGIARISM AND THE LAW OF QUOTATION.*

[FIRST PAPER.]

A PLAGIARIST, according to Webster, is: "A thief in literature; one who purloins another's writings, and offers them to the public as his own." We are told by another authority that "among the Romans a plagiarist was properly a person who bought, sold, or retained a freeman for a slave, and was so called because by the Flavian law such persons were con-

* It is the purpose of these articles to bring together the literature of this subject. The writer has avoided, as far as possible, exposing himself to the imputation of plagiarizing on the subject of plagiarism. He is necessarily indebted for his facts to a host of authors. He has acknowledged them as far as it was a possibility. More than this is not demanded by the highest literary honor.

demned *ad plagas* to be whipped." In the modern sense it means one who uses in any way as his own the thoughts or words of another. According to Chancellor Haven, (see "Rhetoric," p. 314,) "Plagiarism is the stealing of the expressions, and especially the written productions, of another person, and passing them off as original." This definition is qualified, and we think somewhat weakened, as follows: "At the same time, thoughts first expressed by another, facts related by him, may be used without plagiarism." (*Ib.*, p. 314.) Again: "There may be original combination and application of old material." In this definition and the subsequent comments the door is first closely shut and firmly bolted, then the bolts are drawn back, the door thrown widely open, the thief politely ushered in, and then as deferentially bowed out. There is hardly a literary theft which these weakening qualifications will not excuse or justify.

The Chancellor, however, is in good company. Johnson teaches with an authoritativeness which, in view of his prestige as a herculean *litterateur*, a modern critic will be slow to dissent from, that "The author who only imitates his predecessors by furnishing himself with thoughts and elegances out of the same general magazine of literature can with little more propriety be reproached as a plagiary than the architect can be censured as a mean copier of Angelo or Wren because he digs his marble from the same quarry, squares his stones by the same art, and unites them in columns of the same order."—"Rambler," No. 143. *

It is obvious that in proportion to their accuracy all definitions and descriptions must be alike. The metamorphoses of mythology are the common property of scholars the world over. He who alludes to them, or who weaves their details into his story or song, only resembles some predecessor from whom a carping criticism may have said he purloined. The passage of Orpheus to hell and the second loss of Eurydice have been described by Pope after Boetius, and yet the description is not an imitation of Boetius, or a theft, any more

* "When we are praising Plato, it seems we are praising quotations from Solon, and Sophron, and Philolaus. Be it so. Every book is a quotation; and every house is a quotation out of all forests, and mines, and stone quarries; and every man is a quotation from all his ancestors."—Emerson's "Rep. Men," p. 46.

than a picture of the same event by different artists is a theft. When N. P. Willis says,

> "The aged pilgrim, ere he lays him down,
> Prays for a moment's lulling of the blast,
> A little time to wind his cloak about him,
> And smooth his gray hairs, decently to die,"

he reminds us of Bryant, who, in his "Thanatopsis," bids us approach the grave—

> "Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

But it does not follow that the one is the copyist of the other.

Without in the least intending to deny the disgraceful prevalence of the meaner forms of plagiarism, or in any way detracting from its enormity, we venture to affirm that it is one of the penalties of authorship that charges of plagiarism have inevitably to be met in some form or other. A professional critic of some talent, called Lauder, once brought the charge of plagiarism against Milton with great minuteness of detail. He alleged that he had found the *prima stamnia* of "Paradise Lost" in "*Adamus Exul*," a tragedy by Grotius. "The ingenious critic," says an anonymous paper on Printed Forgeries in "Household Words," "rendered the admirers of Milton very uncomfortable, until the appearance of a pamphlet by Rev. John Douglas, who had a very simple but very convincing story to tell. In the year 1690, it appears, there was printed in London a Latin translation of the 'Paradise Lost,' 'Paradise Regained,' and 'Samson Agonistes,' by one Hogaeus, as he called himself on the title-page, or Hogg, as he was probably known by his personal friends. And, further, it was very plainly proved that the greater portion of the passages cited by Mr. Lauder were not quotations from Masenius Grotius, but from the very intelligent translation, by Hogaeus, of Milton himself! The striking and frequently literal resemblance between these quotations and passages in Milton's work may thus be easily conceived. In cases where Mr. Lauder had not availed himself of Hogaeus, he had not scrupled to interpolate and manufacture whole passages, which never had any existence in the writing of the authors from whom he pretended to quote.

"Whatever doubt might exist after Mr. Douglas' very valuable pamphlet with regard to the entire falsity of the charges brought against Milton, it was speedily set at rest by Mr. Lauder himself, in 'An Apology' which he 'most humbly addressed' to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1751, wherein he makes an abject confession of his fraud."

A writer in "Notes and Queries" has labored to prove that the germ of Addison's "Vision of Mirza" was to be found in Erasmus' "Colloquies," but it only needs a careful reading of the passages cited from each to see that the charge has not the slightest foundation in fact. So in a review of the "Life of Wordsworth," it is charged that Wordsworth borrowed broadly and clumsily from the magnificent couplet in which Gray depicts the overflowing of the Nile under the figure of a brooding bird. Thus Gray:—

> "From his broad bosom life and verdure flings,
> And broods o'er Egypt with his watery wings."

Wordsworth, in alluding to the "mighty stream" of the French Revolution, invokes it to

> "Brood o'er the long-parched lands with Nile-like wings."

The reviewer asks, with a hypercriticism positively amusing, "What mind could extemporize for itself the noble image of Gray?" We venture the answer, that Wordsworth achieved, in the very instance adduced, what the critic deemed to be an impossibility. It is somewhat amusing that the author who brings this charge extenuates all such offenses, so far as Wordsworth is concerned, by intimating that "he borrowed but little," and then robs the extenuation of all its force by charging that he took "more from Milton than from any one else."

In 1851 there appeared in this review a *résumé* of "The Life and Works of Sir Thomas Browne." The writer quotes, with high admiration, a passage from Sir Thomas, of which these are the opening lines: "... There is music in the silent note which Cupid strikes, far sweeter than the sound of an instrument. For there is music wheresoever there is a harmony, order, or proportion; and thus far we maintain the music of the spheres; for those well-ordered motions and regular paces,

though they give no sound to the ear, yet to the understanding they strike a note most full of harmony." We have not space for the entire passage, which rises in eloquence to the end. After a glowing and impassioned eulogy on the majesty and devoutness of the author's figures, the writer inquires: "Where but from this remarkable passage did Addison get the thought contained in his paraphrase of the Nineteenth Psalm—

"'The spacious firmament on high,' etc.?

And where, if not from this noble passage, did Bushnell catch the inspiration of the most eloquent passage in his 'Work and Play?'" Bushnell's address was delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa at Cambridge, in 1848. The portion of the address thus put under the scalpel may be found upon the twenty-eighth page. "The resemblance, however," says a defender of our countryman, "is one of kindred, and not at all of imitation. Though we think the knight assisted the orator, yet it was only as the sun helps the earth to bring forth and mature her natural products. Though the spark came from the flint of the physician, it fell upon appropriate fuel in the genius of the preacher. The fire is doubtless the same, but the flames differ in shape and intensity." The writer of this article playfully asked Dr. Bushnell, "Where," etc. He said, "Not from Sir Thomas Browne, I am sure, but from watching a kitten play." In like manner, no doubt, Addison was free from all obligation save to the stars, which he saw as well as did Sir Thomas Browne, noiselessly and harmoniously walking in brightness through those heavens which have given kindred inspiration to the physicians, poets, and orators of all lands.

Obligation to preceding or contemporary writers is by no means incompatible with originality. The Ettrick Shepherd shrewdly intimates that, according to the ideas of some, there is no originality unless we "first read all the books that ever were written, and then write something that was not in any of them." Coleridge has been charged with appropriating the ideas of Lessing, and some have stoutly maintained that his Shakspearean criticisms were based on the lectures of Schlegel. That the views of Lessing affected the thought, and even had an influence on the language of Coleridge, there can be no

doubt; but there is nothing in that to impair his title to originality. As to the supposed plagiarism from Schlegel, Mrs. Coleridge has shown most conclusively that the lectures of Schlegel did not appear until Coleridge had developed his views publicly in England many times. They both started from the same point in their investigations, and both had access to the labors of the same precursors. It is no wonder, therefore, that they wrote and lectured alike.

All literary men are subject to what may be called unconscious reminiscences. They cannot always be conscious of the source of their own thoughts. The warp may be their own—in form and fact self-originated—but the woof may be a contribution from the ample, well-filled storehouse of memory. Pascal made a constant and instant record of the movements of his own mind, yet his "Penseés" are by no means original. Pope, when he gives us as his own one of Rochefoucauld's maxims, was, without doubt, a victim of unconscious recollection. It requires not only more than the average literary honesty, but also scrupulous care, such as few are willing to impose upon themselves, to avoid giving their reminiscences as forms of original thought. Gilman, in his "Life of Coleridge," says that memory is of two kinds, "passive" and "creative," the first retaining the names of things, figures, and numbers; while with the other we recall facts and theories. There can be no valid objection brought against the use of the memory when it is in its creative mood. In reading, some are like a dog drinking from a river as he runs:—

"Secut canis ad Nilam bitens et fugiens."

Others are more industrious and methodical. They say, as did old Ancillo:—

"Aurum ex stercore Eunii colligo."

And if they wash their auriferous treasures, or, what would be better, purify them in the fire of their own assimilating intellect, they may profitably beat them out for ornament, or stamp them for vulgar currency. It is said of Frederick W. Robertson, that his retentive memory made him a sort of *synopsis criticorum;* and we say, Happy is the man who has such a memory. Still, the avowal of the fact that what we write is

reminiscences is not an absolute guarantee of literary honesty, for the reminiscences themselves may be stolen. It has been charged on Lord Holland that in his "Foreign Reminiscences," edited by his son, and published in London, in 1850, he plagiarized many of his anecdotes from Blanco White, who had been his tutor, and who published certain letters about Spain under the ingenious *alias* of Don Leucadio Doblado, though those anecdotes were, *ex facie*, the most worthless part of White's book.

When alleged plagiarisms do not go beyond reminiscences they are only innocent blemishes. We cannot judge Alexander Smith harshly because he had read, and doubtless remembered, much of Tennyson. His exuberance of expression, his subtlety in the use of similes, secures him his pedestal in the Pantheon of true poets, and places upon his young brow a crown of laurel which the impudent and impotent assaults of ferocious critics have so far failed to destroy. We lament his early and comparatively unnoticed death. The aspersions on his originality are a disgrace to the guild of literary criticism. A rival hand has seen fit to make out a list of petty larcenies against him. Those competent to sift evidence have traversed the list, and dismissed the charge. The accuser—false accuser, we do not hesitate to call him—has had the unenviable satisfaction of knowing that his injustice shortened the days of as loving and tender a spirit as ever aspired to poetical fame. We think that there is even injustice in the patronizing extenuation, that his first book "was assimilative to an unwarrantable degree." If he is measured, as we contend all fledgling authors ought to be, by the number and splendor of the new expressions he gives to thought, both old and new, then he stands upon a pedestal as lofty as that assigned to either Byron or Shelley.

There is keen irony in the intimation of "Punch," when noticing what the "Athenæum" is pleased to call its exposure of the plagiarisms of this young poet, that Mr. S. was "left without the faintest rag of reputation." It gives an array of proof, the value of which we can judge by the following:—

In Mr. Smith's "City Poems" he says:—

"And *bees* are *busy* in the yellow hive."

What says Dr. Watts?—

"How doth the *busy, busy bee*? . . ."

Mr. Smith:—

"*Night* and the *moon* above."

Latin Dilectus:—

"*Nox* erat, *lunar*que fulgebat."

Mr. Smith:—

"*Earth* gives her slow *consent*."

Old Hundredth Psalm:—

"With one *consent* let all the *earth*."

Mr. Smith:—

"Each *star* that, *twinkling* in the sky."

Original Poems for Infant Minds:—

"*Twinkle, twinkle*, little star. . . ."

Mr. Smith:—

"*Cradled* on yonder lofty *pine*."

Nursery Song:—

"Hush-a-by, baby, *on the tree top;*
When the wind blows the *cradle* will rock."

After such "damning proof" as this we do not wonder that "Punch" says, "There is not a single word in all Mr. Smith's poetry that has not been previously used by somebody else."

Parallel passages of the most remarkable similitude can be adduced from authors to whom the suspicion of plagiarism can hardly be attached. When Longfellow, in his "Hyperion," says: "In this world a man must be either anvil or hammer," he was anticipated by a writer in "Fraser's Magazine," who, in 1838, sang:—

"Thou must either serve or govern,
Must be slave, or must be sovereign;
Must, in fine, be block or wedge,
Must be anvil, or be sledge."

This is only a parallelism. Victor Hugo runs parallel with both when he says in "Fantine:" "My choice is made; I must eat or be eaten, and I choose to eat. It is better to be the tooth than the grass. Such is my philosophy."

I find Shelley singing of

> "Many an antenatal tomb,
> Where butterflies dream of the life to come."

Southey, in the same line of thought, when speaking of our sense of flying in our sleep, tells us that it may be a "forefeeling of an unevolved power, like an Aurelias' dream of butterfly motion." This is almost proof positive that the same thought may occur to two independent thinkers, and that they may clothe it in similar verbiage. A similar parallelism occurs between Dryden and Byron. The latter says to the ocean:—

> "E'er from out thy slime
> The monsters of the deep are formed."

So Dryden:—

> "Yet monsters from thy large increase we find,
> Engendered in the slime thou leavest behind."

Montaigne can be traced through all literature. It has been asserted that even Shakspeare profited by his "*Essais*." The charge, however, cannot be successfully maintained. That Lord Bacon drew some of his brightest flame from this burning-well can be demonstrated. Portions of his "Essays" are but bold abridgments of Montaigne.

There are various degrees of literary larceny. Rabelais is guilty in the first degree, Lawrence Sterne in the second. Both pilfered from the inexhaustible Essays of Michael de Montaigne. The theories of Locke and of Rousseau on the subject of education, it is alleged, "have been transported bodily" from Montaigne, the Genevese choosing "the more objectionable and fantastic parts," and the Englishman choosing only "that which was solid and sensible." To what extent it is modest and lawful for a writer to copy, adapt, digest, or abridge the writings of others without direct acknowledgment and distinct reference, is an open question in literary ethics, but it cannot remain so much longer. That there is such a thing as honest mental digestion and a legitimate process of literary assimilation, no one doubts. Much less is it doubted that, under this and other plausible pretexts, no small amount of literary swindling is attempted to be covered up. In the January number of this Review, 1849, Dr. M'Clintock furnished a short but pungent article, in which he investi-

gates a charge of plagiarism against Dr. Paley: "Well do we remember," says he, "the delightful impression of satisfaction which the opening paragraph of Dr. Paley's Natural Theology made upon our minds when we took up that work in college days. Especially did 'the watch,' found in that lone walk over the heath, strike us, as it has done thousands of others, as the most apt and perfect specimen of illustration that we have ever seen. Alas for human frailty! the watch was *stolen*, spring, wheels, dial-plate, glass, and all! All this appears, and more, from an apparently well-sustained charge of plagiarism, brought against Archdeacon Paley by a writer in the 'Athenæum.'" After traversing the details of the proofs adduced by a writer in the "Athenæum," the doctor says: "To call such wholesale theft as this a 'legitimate use of authority' is to play at fast and loose, not merely with words, but common honesty." A defender of Dr. Paley in a subsequent number of the "Athenæum" tries to find an excuse for him by saying, that as Dr. Paley mentions the name of Nieuwentyt, from whom he had purloined both arguments and illustrations, there could be no intention on his part to conceal his acquaintance with Nieuwentyt's book, or his obligation to him. To this defense Dr. M'Clintock says: "The *particular* reference only makes the case the stronger, as negativing, at least by implication, the general appropriation of the work referred to." This, we think, is an indorsement, in advance, of the views we hold in regard to the laws of quotation. The whole subject is closed with this significant passage:—

Another writer in the "Athenæum" finds a different solution of the difficulty, namely, that the work grew out of Paley's oral lectures, delivered while tutor in Christ College, and that, as nearly thirty years elapsed between the delivery of the lectures and the publication of the book, the writer forgot the sources of his early information. There is some plausibility in this. College lectures are mainly compilations, and as in their oral delivery it would be little less than absurd to give every authority, it is not unusual for lecturers to omit references even in their manuscript. But the man who could, after the lapse of even twice thirty years, print such a compilation as his own, must either be dishonest or a dotard. Now, it is not pretended that Paley was in his dotage when he published the "Natural Theology;" he was too shrewd a man not to know what he was about; it therefore remains for us, as far as we can now see, to class him among the great plagiarists.

In connection with this alleged theft of the argument from design, it may be safely affirmed that not only may the argument be traced back to Xenophon, who, in his "*Memorabilia*" has embalmed the germ of the idea, but that its illustrations have been floating down to us through long lines of doctors of divinity and professors of moral philosophy, to be utilized with unnumbered and marvelous "new attachments" in the modern lectures of Joseph Cook, who, with a subtlety and ingenuity we are compelled to admire, substitutes for the watch the more wonderful cup of Neptune. So far as Paley is concerned we are inclined to think that a charge of plagiarism does lie unanswered, which deducts from his fame as a teacher of sacred philosophy; and it does not help the reputation of this otherwise respected author, that a story has got into traditional circulation that he advised his pupils, in the matter of making sermons, to make one and steal three. Such advice is presumably possible in a divine who, in his published ethics, unblushingly affirms that whatever is "expedient upon the whole" is right. A theory of which even respectable heathen have been ashamed.

Gregory the Great is said, on the authority of Disraeli, as quoted in the "Edinburgh Review," to have burned the works of Varro, the learned Roman, that Saint Austin might escape from the charge of plagiarism, being deeply indebted to Varro for much of his great work, "The City of God." This, according to the "Edinburgh Review," is not the only irreparable loss that has been attributed to plagiarism. Cicero's treatise, "*De Gloria*," was extant in the fourteenth century, and in the possession of Petrarch, but he lent it and it was lost. Two centuries later it was traced to a convent library, from which it had disappeared under circumstances justifying a suspicion that the guardian of the library, Pierre Alegonius, had destroyed it, to conceal the fraudulent use made of the contents for his treatise "*De Exsilio*," "many pages of which," to borrow a simile from the "Critic," "lie upon the surface, like lumps of marl on a barren moor, encumbering what they cannot fertilize." Leonard Aretin, believing himself the sole possessor of a manuscript of Procopius on the War of the Goths, translated it into Latin, and passed for the author, until another copy turned up. The "*Causeur*" relates a similar anecdote of

Augustin Barbosa, Bishop of Ugento, who printed a treatise, "*De Officio Episcoporum.*" His cook had brought home a fish wrapped in a leaf of Latin manuscript. The prelate had the curiosity to read the fragment. Struck with the subject, he ran to the market and ransacked the stalls till he had discovered the book from which the leaf had been torn. It was the treatise, "*De Officio,*" which, adding very little of his own, he published among his works, "to the great glory of God." This was a bolder stroke for fame than that of an Irish bishop, still living, who incorporated a brother divine's sermon into his charge. Plagiarism, however, was not esteemed so heinous an offense formerly as it is at present, and our actual stores of thought and knowledge have been enriched by it. Thus, Sulpicius Servius, the Christian Sallust, is believed to have copied his account of the capture of Jerusalem from the lost book of Tacitus.

John Dennis, late in the seventeenth century, wrote a play, which he enlivened by inventing for its public rendering a new kind of stage thunder. The play, however, notwithstanding the thunder, was damned. Some nights after, at a representation of Macbeth, he heard his thunder. He rose in a violent passion and exclaimed, "See how the rascals use me! They will not let my play run, and yet they steal my thunder." The exclamation has entitled its author to literary immortality.

## ART. V.—DANIEL WEBSTER.

*Reminiscences and Anecdotes of Daniel Webster.* By PETER HARVEY. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1877.

A GREAT man is always an object of interest; and when he is gone every additional beam of light cast on his memory attracts public attention. The American people never tire of looking at Washington or Jefferson, or the other great characters of our heroic days, in every possible light; and the interest in them seems to increase as we recede from the events made memorable by their activities. Daniel Webster stands nearer to us, and the passions and prejudices which colored his

public acts have not, as yet, wholly died out; but they have become so softened by the mellowing influence of time that all facts and incidents relating to his career have a better opportunity to exert their proper influence. Hence a new book on Webster is not only a matter of interest to the general reader, but is also important in helping us to correct erroneous opinions, and to eradicate unfounded prejudices.

In this regard the "Reminiscences" of Mr. Harvey have some advantages over ordinary biography. The author was for many years the friend and confidant of Mr. Webster, and, as he does not undertake to give a complete history of the statesman's life, he has the better opportunity to enter into particulars respecting those fragments with which he was more or less associated. His relation to his friend was, in some important respects, like that of Boswell to Johnson. He was his reporter, and put down the words as they fell from his lips. In this way his hero is often made to explain the motives of his own action. Mr. Webster's public life ran through so many years of eventful history, and he was so conspicuous in the affairs of the nation, standing sometimes in the way of partisan success and individual ambition, and sometimes as their shield and defense, that he was at once the target for general abuse and for indiscriminate praise. The mind, therefore, turns with a sense of relief to any thing which seems to uncover facts on which we can rest with some feeling of reliance.

There was nothing very remarkable about Mr. Webster's early life. All the indications are that he was a good, obedient, dutiful boy; a diligent scholar, who acquired knowledge easily; a young man of good habits and morals, who gave abundant promise of future distinction. His father was a farmer in moderate circumstances, and heavily in debt; a plain, pious, church-going, hard-working man, with ten children, who grew more and more respectable and influential as he grew in years; and, whether a soldier in the army of Washington, a laborer on his farm in Salisbury, N. H., or an inferior judge on the bench of the County Court, his trust was always performed with faithfulness and ability, and with a scrupulous and conscientious integrity.

Daniel was the ninth child and the youngest son. In his

school days he had shown such facility in mastering his lessons, and was so diligent and ready of understanding, that his teachers and some influential neighbors, familiar with the family, thought that he ought to be liberally educated, and brought the matter to the notice of his father. For some time the father resisted their importunities, not deeming himself able to incur the expense; but the Rev. Samuel Wood, LL.D., with whom Daniel was pursuing his studies in the neighboring town of Boscawen, and Dr. Abbott, of the Exeter Academy, where he had spent nine months at school, after consulting together, had an interview with the elder Webster, which ended in an arrangement for Daniel to be sent to Dartmouth. In after years Mr. Webster, in referring to the circumstance, said that he was riding with his father in a sleigh through a deep snow, when the matter was broken to him; and, after saying that he was greatly surprised and overjoyed at the news, he adds: "I laid my head on my father's shoulder, and wept."

He entered college at fifteen, and as a student was punctual and laborious, always seeming to have a sense of the sacrifices made on his account. At the annual vacation he was either at home helping his father on the farm, or away engaged in teaching, to lighten the parental burden. Next older than Daniel was his brother Ezekiel, the companion of his boyhood, to whom he was greatly attached. He was his father's main dependence; but Daniel was greatly solicitous on his account, and asked that he might be relieved as much as possible from the farm, and have a chance to go to school; and, after he had entered on his law studies with Mr. Thompson, he left them for a season, and taught in the Fryeburgh Academy, Me., to earn money to help his brother through college. Both were "heinously unprovided," but it did not prevent either of them from rising to great eminence. Ezekiel was one of the first lawyers in New Hampshire, but died suddenly in 1829. Mr. Webster's chief regret, after his famous encounter with Hayne, was that his brother had passed away, and could not share in his triumph.*

* Ezekiel attended college at Hanover, where Daniel visited him on his way home from Fryeburgh, after the completion of his term. Mr. Webster was accustomed to speak of this meeting with much feeling, and on one occasion said: "We walked and talked during a long evening; and, finally, seated on an old log, not far from the college, I gave him one hundred dollars, the result of my labors in teaching.

But, although Daniel was poor, and "did the literature of a weekly paper," and recorded deeds, and taught school to help "the situation," it need not be inferred that his advantages for education were inferior to others. On the other hand, it is pretty certain that they were above those of most young men who obtain a liberal education. Thomas W. Thompson, with whom he studied law at Boscawen (not far from his father's house) was a college graduate, had been a tutor at Harvard, a member of the lower House of Congress, and a Senator, and was a lawyer of large practice; and in Boston, in the office of Governor Gore, where his studies were completed, he was brought into close association with the first minds of New England. But all that need be said of these early years of the future statesman is, that he was correct in his deportment, honoring the religious training of his father's house, and fairly improving all the great opportunities which fell in his way.

He was admitted to the bar in March, 1805, when he was twenty-three years old. As a student in college he had received the usual discipline in the art of public speaking, and must have attained to some distinction; for so early as his second year, when he was seventeen years old, he was chosen to deliver the Fourth-of-July oration, (1800,) an effort so creditable that it went into print in the Dartmouth paper; then in the following year he pronounced a funeral oration over a member of his class; and again, while teaching at Fryeburgh, he did the oratory for "Independence-day," (1802,) and a vote of thanks was accorded him by the board of trustees, which went on the records of the academy—"and that he would accept *five dollars* as a small acknowledgment of their sense of his services."

At the conclusion of his studies with Governor Gore, in Boston, he was offered the clerkship of a court in New Hampshire, and was greatly elated over his good fortune, the salary being two thousand dollars—enough to keep him handsomely, and relieve the necessities of his father and brother. But, on taking the letter to Governor Gore, that gentleman looked very serious

and in recording deeds, after paying my own debts; and leaving to myself but three dollars to get home with."

When at Fryeburgh Mr. Webster was paid at the rate of three hundred dollars per year. He boarded with the register of deeds, who paid him twenty-five cents apiece for recording deeds, and much of his time was spent in this work; but he had a borrowed copy of Blackstone, which he found time to read with care.

over it, and advised that the place should not be accepted. He said that he was aware of the importance of the salary to his pupil; but he was now ready to begin the life for which he had been preparing himself, and the clerkship would withdraw him from more important professional duties, and be a permanent injury. Mr. Webster was not convinced, but he promised to act on the advice of his preceptor, and very reluctantly turned away from his assured prosperity to continue in his position of extreme dependence. He says:—

> I went up to Boscawen, and opened a law office in a red store, with stairs on the outside, for which I paid a rent of fifteen dollars per year. I lived at home, and walked to and from the office at morning and at night. I had resolved never to leave home during the life of my father, no matter what might betide. I stayed by him two years. I did not, in those two years, make money enough to pay the rent of the office; but I stayed till my father died. I closed his eyes, and received his blessing. Then I started for Portsmouth, and began my career of life.

His two years at home had been years of preparation. Although he made no money, he had considerable practice—enough to give him confidence and drive him to his books. He opened his office in Portsmouth, in 1807, and took his position at once among the most distinguished lawyers in New Hampshire. A year later he married Grace Fletcher, the daughter of a clergyman in Hopkinton, an attractive and beautiful woman, who was his "good angel," and should have lived always, instead of leaving him, after twenty years, to face the corruptions of the world without her restraining influence.

His personal appearance at this period of his life was dignified and impressive, and the awkwardness of his earlier years had gone. He had a stout frame, but was slender and light of weight, his head large, his hair black, his dress without a fault, his eye so full and expressive that at home he was called "All Eyes," and his complexion dark—not so dark as to warrant the appellation of "Black Dan," given to him by his opponents, but dark enough to give point to the rough wit of old General Stark, when he said: "Well, yes, come to think, you must be a son of old Captain Eb. In the war we couldn't tell whether Captain Webster's face was natural color or blackened by powder; and you are a cursed sight blacker than he was."

As Mr. Webster, during his preparatory studies, had been associated with men of learning and endowments, so, at the Portsmouth bar, he had to contend with some of the foremost legal minds of his day. It was probably partly owing to this fact, but still more to a certain innate love of dignity, that, in his intercourse with the bar, he was always good-tempered, observant of parliamentary law, and scrupulous in regarding those courtesies prevalent in the best circles of society. He was uniformly respectful to his opponents, obedient to the rules and orders of the court, and had such mastery of himself as not to be betrayed into any angry retorts or unbecoming personalities, by the most skillful goading of the "learned gentlemen on the other side." These habits he carried with him into political life; and if the old Senate was "the most dignified body in the world," it was owing largely to his presence in it. The uniform respect which he always paid to the rulings of the presiding officer, his scrupulous regard for the feelings of others, and his careful attention to all the decorum of a public body, had a wonderful influence on other Senators, and the effect is felt in that body to this day. He was free from tricks, and his bearing had an air of consideration for all with whom he had any dealings. In speaking, he made his impression by seizing on the strong points of the case, and urging them with manly force. The facts which he professed to state were always facts; his authorities were those uniformly conceded to be authorities, and his application of them fair and legitimate.

In the Sanborn case, as Mr. Harvey tells us, while he was arguing to the jury with his accustomed clearness and force, he had occasion to cite some English case, and did so without being particular to give the volume and the page where it could be found. Augustus Peabody, one of the opposing counsel, who is described as a sort of walking dictionary of law, and familiar with all the authorities, interrupted him, and called for the volume and the page. Mr. Webster paid no attention to the interruption, but went on steadily with his argument. Pretty soon Mr. Peabody was noticed in consultation with his associate, Mr. Hoar, and after a moment arose and claimed the protection of the court, saying that Mr. Webster was citing authorities without stating where they could be found. Chief-Justice Shaw was on the bench, and said that counsel had a right

to know where cases could be found, and the court would also like to know. Mr. Webster replied in his serious way, as follows:—

It is not very good manners to interrogate me in the midst of a sentence addressed to the jury. It is a practice in which I never indulge. I always let counsel have their say, and do as well as I can in answering them. This interrupting I do not like. It is rather a bad habit of my learned friend on the other side, and is quite annoying. He has appealed to me somewhat as if I had quoted a case that was fictitious. What I would say in answer is, that the case, as I narrated it, (giving particulars,) occurred in the third year of Lord Eldon in Chancery. In what particular volume, on what particular page, how many lines from the top, I don't know. I never trouble myself with these matters. Peabody has nothing else to do, and can hunt it up.*

This little reply is curiously comprehensive. It is (1) a vindication; it is (2) a reproof; it is (3) a censure; it is (4) a deprecation—it belittles and makes insignificant the learning of an able opponent; and, in addition to all this, it exposes a characteristic feature in Mr. Webster's method. It was true of him that he was not disposed to interfere with others when they were speaking—was not nettlesome under fire. It was especially true of him that he was not careful about minor points if he could make strong the major ones. He did not mind the page and the line, or the exact words, so that he made perfectly clear the point in hand. He made his impression more by a clear statement of the facts than by syllogistic argument; and hence his speeches are almost bare of quotations. In his second reply to Hayne, covering, perhaps, a hundred pages of ordinary book print, the quotations hardly amount to what a printer would call a *stick-full*, while its logic was so complete as to carry the Senate and the country.

The Bar and the Senate are alike the theater of conflict; and where there is assault there must necessarily be defense. In these conflicts it is exceedingly difficult to avoid being goaded into hasty and passionate reply. Hence it is that half the time of every Congress is taken up with matters personal, and too often disgracefully personal. But Mr. Webster was always able to command himself. The passage of arms between him and Mr. Hayne assumed a highly personal tone, and

* "Harvey," pp. 95, 96.

some of Mr. Webster's friends were greatly concerned about his reply, fearing that he would be driven into a personal contest. It had its origin in that intense sectional feeling which a few years later culminated in open rebellion, and Mr. Hayne did not spare the North or its champion. It may be worth while, therefore, to recall from the speech of Mr. Webster a single passage to show the spirit in which he met and parried these "poisoned arrows." He said:—

> The gentleman, sir, in declining to postpone the debate, told the Senate, with the emphasis of his hand upon his heart, that there was something rankling *here* which he wished to relieve. (Mr. Hayne arose, and disclaimed the use of the word *rankling*.) It would not, continued Mr. Webster, be safe for the honorable member to appeal to those around him; but he may have been unconscious of it. At any rate, it is enough that he disclaims it. But still, with or without the use of that particular word, he had yet something *here*, he said, of which he wished to rid himself by an immediate reply. In this respect, sir, I have a great advantage over the honorable gentleman. There is nothing *here* which gives me the slightest uneasiness. Neither fear, nor anger, nor that which is sometimes more troublesome than either, the consciousness of having been in the wrong. . . . And, sir, while there is nothing originating *here* which I wished or now wish to discharge, nothing has been received *here* which rankles, or in any way gives me annoyance. I will not accuse the honorable member of violating the rules of civilized war; I will not say that he poisoned his arrows; but, whether his shafts were, or were not, dipped in that which would have caused rankling if they had reached, there was not, as it happened, quite strength enough in the bow to bring them to their mark.

This extraordinary power of command over himself was, from the first, a great element of success, and, young as he was, he at once took his position as the peer of the ablest and most experienced. Mr. Everett says:—

> The promise of his youth and the expectation of those who had known him as a student were more than fulfilled. He took a position as a counselor and advocate above which no one has ever risen in this country. A large share of the best business of New England was poured into his hands, and the veterans of the Boston bar admitted him to an entire equality of standing, repute, and influence.

His fame grew apace, spreading rapidly over the State; and in 1812, five years after his settlement, he was nominated for Congress, and elected on the Federal ticket. War had then

just been declared against England, and the times were exceedingly stormy. The Federal party was the party of opposition, and, being strongest in the commercial States, felt the war to be exceedingly oppressive. Mr. Webster went into Congress as the opponent of the war, and made himself felt at once. He was consequently assailed with great bitterness, but maintained his position with rare dignity. In one of his speeches he said: "I honor the people that shrink from such a contest as this. I applaud their sentiments. They are such as religion and humanity dictate." For this and other like expressions he was held to a severe account by the war party; and the "Patriot," published at Concord, never ceased to goad him with contemptuous and insolent personalities. It had been purchased three years before by Isaac Hill, a young printer just out of his time, who was giving indications of remarkable vigor, and was making it a power in the State. He assailed Mr. Webster in every possible form of abuse. He spoke of him as "exceedingly flippant in arguing petty suits in the courts of law," accused him of "deliberate falsehood," called him a "cold-blooded wretch, whose heart was callous to every patriotic feeling," held him up as the "tool of the enemy," a "conspirator against the Union," a pretender whom "you would suppose was a great merchant living in a maritime city, and not a man reared in the *woods of Salisbury*, or educated in the *wilds of Hanover*."

This course was pursued through many years, but it did not prevent Mr. Webster from growing steadily in the public favor; and when Mr. Hill, many years afterward, took his seat in the United States Senate by the side of Mr. Webster, it was to find the man "reared in the *woods of Salisbury*" the intellectual giant of that body. He was re-elected in 1814, and took part in all the great questions then before Congress; and was exceptionally strong in the discussions that arose about chartering the United States Bank, breaking down the first plan presented, and not voting for the second. He also procured the passage of a resolution requiring all the revenues of the Government to be paid in its legal currency. This was then a measure of immense importance, and corrected a vast amount of mischief. In the mean time his house in Plymouth took fire and burned down, confirming him in a half-formed reso-

lution to leave Plymouth and take up his residence in Boston, which he did in 1816.

While Mr. Webster stood by his party in opposition to the war, he was careful not to oppose the appropriations which were necessary to make it successful, and to bring it to a close; and there is no evidence that he justified, as some of his party did, the searches which were largely the cause of the war. The claim for the right of search for the purpose of impressment, so long persisted in by Great Britain, now appears to us as utterly preposterous; but it was then evidently regarded by the English Government as a veritable right, and was maintained for many years with arbitrary power. The records of the State Department show that over six thousand seamen were thus impressed. The claim was, that the British Government had a right to the services of its own subjects, and could take them forcibly out of any neutral merchant vessel, in time of war, on the ground that, under English law, the obligation of the subject is perpetual. But, besides the outrage of search, it so happened that natives of the United States, who owed no allegiance to Great Britain whatever, were just as likely to be seized and impressed as actual British subjects. The lieutenant of a man-of-war, wanting men, and having a strong Government behind him, was not likely to make very nice distinctions; and hence, so early as April 13, 1797, Mr. King, our Minister, wrote to the Secretary of State "that he had made application for the discharge from British men-of-war of two hundred and seventy-one seamen who, stating themselves to be Americans, have claimed my interference."

But, while the war was largely in the interest of seamen, and the political battle-cry of the Democratic party was "Free trade and sailors' rights," the treaty of peace was strangely silent on the subject of impressment, and the claim of England, though no longer exercised, had not been relinquished. Hence it was that, many years afterward, when Mr. Webster was Secretary of State under John Tyler, this was still an open question. All our diplomacy for more than fifty years, including an expensive war of great discomfort to the nation, had failed to bring the English Government to a sense of this wrong, and it remained for Mr. Webster to accomplish it by such an exhibition of the facts in their relation to well established prin-

ciples of international law as made its further justification impossible.

The importance of a clear perception, and the power to state it in such fitting words as to make it clear to others, was never more obvious than in the effect produced by Mr. Webster's letter of August 8, 1842, on this subject. Theodore Parker says of it that "it would have done honor to any statesman in the world." It seems, on reading it now, like a simple statement of recognized facts; but the subject was not then so well understood, and its clear and conclusive reasoning made a strong impression. The main point of the letter was this: That British law could not govern British subjects outside of British territory; that a British ship on the ocean was British territory, and an American ship was American territory; and, hence, "that in every documented American merchant vessel the crew who navigate it will find their protection in the flag which is over them."

On the subject of this letter there is a pleasant passage in Mr. Harvey's book, giving notes of a conversation with Mr. Webster, which will not be out of place here. It will be remembered that Lord Ashburton came to this country and negotiated with Mr. Webster what is known as the Ashburton Treaty, settling the North-eastern boundary question, and establishing measures for the suppression of the slave-trade. Lord Ashburton would not consent to take up the impressment question, and Mr. Webster, therefore, addressed him a letter which he was to bear to our Minister in England for the British Foreign Secretary. Mr. Webster told Mr. Harvey that he had long desired an opportunity to express his views, and that nothing had surprised him more than the failure on the part of eminent statesmen to get at the real point of this controversy. He said:—

Even John Quincy Adams, with all his knowledge of diplomacy and international law, failed, I think, to meet the case; and if he failed to meet it, it would be pretty hard for any body else to meet it, for he was exceedingly apt in those things. In my judgment there was but one course, and that was flatly to deny the right. Nothing short of that would meet the trouble. That is the only ground to take. Every ship that sails the ocean must find its protection in its flag. Well, when I proposed, after the

boundary question was done with, to settle this disputed question, Lord Ashburton said he did not wish me to write him any letters on that subject. Consequently, the dispatch which I wrote was sent to our Minister, to present to the English Minister. Mr. Everett was then our envoy to the Court of St. James. He told me that he read the dispatch to the Earl of Aberdeen, who was Foreign Secretary, and who was a tough-headed, bluff old Scotchman. As usual, he did not pay much attention at first, but finally became interested, and, interrupting, said: "Wont you read that again, Mr. Everett?" He did so; and, as soon as he had finished reading, Lord Aberdeen asked for a copy of the dispatch. "Mr. Everett," said he, "that American Secretary of State writes very extraordinary papers. That is a remarkable document. The argument in that paper cannot be answered. Mr. Webster has got the right of it." Mr. Everett, of course, enjoyed the compliment very much; and, after parting from the earl, he received a note from him requesting that he would please consider their conversation private and confidential. The next time they met, the earl said: "I have not altered my opinion about that dispatch. It has been before her Majesty's Ministers, and they say it must be answered, but I do not know who is going to do it."

Mr. Webster continues:—

Lord Aberdeen was right: the argument is unanswerable. There was no very extraordinary ability in my paper, but the common sense of the thing was apparent. The English Government turned around and attempted to say: "Then you will allow your flag to be desecrated to the practice of piracy. A suspicious-looking craft may be sailing under the flag, and a cruiser may have every reason to suppose that she is a pirate, and she cannot be brought to." Now, I claim no such thing as that. If there is a robber in a man's house, and you break down the door and go in, and find you have got a robber, you are all right; but if you find that he is not a trespasser you must pay the damage: and that is precisely what I say in this matter. You can stop and search this supposed pirate; and if she is a pirate, and has assumed a flag that does not belong to her, then let her be dealt with as such. But suppose it turns out that you are mistaken—that she is no pirate, but a lawful ship. What then? Pay the damage, just as you would in any other case of trespass. That is the distinction. If you had the right to stop every body it would kill all commerce.

There is one thing you may rely upon. The English Government have never answered that dispatch, because they cannot. The common sense of the thing settles that. But they will, perhaps, never admit it, either. The English Minister will not sit down and write a dispatch, saying that he is convinced that the English view is wrong. But they will never again attempt to exercise the right of search. When the issue arises again they will abandon it.—Page 167.

The result has proved Mr. Webster's words to be prophetic. Mr. Harvey calls attention to the fact that the question did come up again during the administration of Mr. Buchanan; and when our Government called the English Government to account for attempting to enforce its old doctrine, the act was disclaimed, and an order given to all British cruisers not to touch any ship sailing under the American flag.

Mr. Webster removed to Boston in 1816, because of his increasing business in that direction, and not apparently with any political purpose. It was seven years after his removal before he again appeared in Congress. But in the meantime he was a member of the convention which reformed the State Constitution, had delivered his great speech on the settlement of New England at Plymouth Rock, and made his successful argument in the Dartmouth College Case before the United States Supreme Court in Washington. This speech, which is regarded as one of his most masterly arguments, was made in 1818, when he was thirty-six years old, and was his first speech before that great tribunal. Professor Goodrich, of Yale College, who went to Washington on purpose to hear it, says that his audience consisted of legal men, the *élite* of the profession throughout the Union, and that Mr. Webster went on in a conversational tone, fixing the attention more and more, his matter being so completely at his command that he scarcely looked at his brief, and continuing for more than four hours, with a statement so luminous, a chain of reasoning so easy and natural, and so near to absolute demonstration, that he carried his audience with him as he went along. But what was altogether unusual was that the room of the Supreme Court, the place of dry argument, should be warmed into such a condition of feeling as to require a great effort to keep from showing it. But when he came to speak of his personal interest in the college (where he was educated) he was greatly affected, and that affected others. He said:—

> You may destroy this little institution. It is weak; it is in your hands. I know it is one of the lesser lights in the horizon of our country. You may put it out; but if you do so you must carry through your work. You must extinguish, one after another, all those great lights of science which for more than a century have thrown their radiance over our land. It is, sir, as I have said, a small college, and yet *there are those who love it.* (Here

he made a long pause, evidently under a strong pressure of feeling, and with the judges also much moved, and then continued.) Sir, I know not how others may feel, (glancing at the opponents of the college, some of whom were its graduates,) but for myself, when I see my *Alma Mater* surrounded, like Cæsar in the Senate House, by those who are thrusting into it stab after stab, I would not for this right hand have her turn to me and say, "Thou, too, my son!"

George S. Hillard, Esq., is authority for saying that he has often heard Judge Story, who was then one of the judges, speak of this speech. He said that "for the first hour we listened to him with perfect astonishment, for the second with perfect delight, and for the third with perfect conviction." Mr. Hillard himself says that Mr. Webster entered the court-room that day almost unknown, and left it with no rival but Pinckney.

This Dartmouth College plea Mr. Webster always regarded as one of his most successful legal arguments, and he associated with it his argument in the Steamboat Case. Mr. Wirt was his senior counsel in this case, and what was curious about it was that Mr. Webster was obliged to overthrow the argument of his colleague in order to establish his own. Mr. Harvey makes Mr. Webster tell the story as follows:—

The Steamboat Case, you remember, was a question of the constitutionality of the right of New York to give a monopoly to Fulton and his heirs forever of the privilege of plying the waters of the Hudson with his steamboats. The value of such a right was not then fully understood. But it seemed to me to be against the very essence of State rights, and a virtual dissolution of the Union *in a commercial sense*. If New York had a right to lay tolls upon her rivers for every body that should pass, then all the other great international rivers and lakes would have the same right, and we could not be one as a commercial people. The people of New York felt that their rights were at stake in the contest, and their great lawyers—and they had many of them—were engaged on that side: the Livingstons and Clintons, and others of like calibre; Mr. Wirt and myself were employed against the monopoly. When the case came to be argued before the Supreme Court in Washington, Chief Justice Marshall presiding, Mr. Wirt and myself met for consultation. Mr. Wirt asked me upon what grounds I based my case—upon what clause of the Constitution. He had a right to ask, as he was my senior in years and in professional fame. My reply was, that the clause of the Constitution which ceded to the general Government the right to regulate commerce among the States was that on which I

should base my defense. He replied that he did not see in that line of argument any ground for our case to rest upon. I said, "Very well; what is yours?" So he told me. I do not recollect what it was, but it was a totally different clause. I said to him: "Mr. Wirt, I will be as frank with you as you have been with me, and say that I do not see the slightest ground to rest our case upon in your view of it." "Very well," replied Mr. Wirt, "let us each argue it in his own way, and we will find out which, if either, is right."

The case came on, and Mr. Wirt made one of his brilliant arguments before the court. I followed with my view.

I can see the Chief-Justice as he looked at that moment. Chief-Justice Marshall always wrote with a quill, and always, before counsel began to argue, the Chief-Justice would nib his pen, and then, when every thing was ready, pulling up the sleeves of his gown, he would nod to the counsel who was to address him, as much as to say, "I am ready; you may go on."

I think I never experienced more intellectual pleasure than in arguing that naval question to a great man who could appreciate it and take it in—and he did take it in, as a baby takes in its mother's milk.

The result of the case was just this: the opinion of the court, as rendered by the Chief-Justice, was little else than a recital of my argument. The Chief-Justice told me that he had little to do but to repeat that argument, as that covered the whole ground; and, what was a little curious, he never referred to the fact that Mr. Wirt had made an argument. He did not speak of it once. That was very singular. It was an accident, I think. Mr. Wirt was a great lawyer and a great man. But sometimes a man gets a kink, and doesn't hit right. That was one of the occasions. But it was nothing against Mr. Wirt.—Page 140.

It was some three years after Mr. Webster's removal to Boston that the country was agitated by the demand of the South to admit the State of Missouri into the Union with slavery, and to establish a line west of Missouri beyond which slavery was not to pass. Mr. Webster had at that time no public position, but he took a conspicuous part against the proposed measure, and a year later, in his Plymouth Rock speech, is a memorable passage, much quoted, strongly denouncing the traffic in slaves. Mr. Webster was outspoken as to the power of Congress to prevent the admission of a State with slavery, and was on a committee which reported that "it is just and expedient that this power should be exercised by Congress upon the admission of all new States created beyond the original territory of the United States." About the same time he was chairman of a committee which reported

that "we have a strong feeling of the injustice of any toleration of slavery." In 1837, at Niblo's Garden, New York, he said the subject of slavery "has not only attracted attention as a question of politics, but has struck much deeper, and arrested the religious feeling of the country. It has taken strong hold of the consciences of men." He thought the country "might be reasoned with" and "made willing" to fulfill "existing engagements and all existing duties;" but any attempt to coerce silence would, he thought, endanger the safety of the republic. He opposed the annexation of Texas, because "it would tend to prolong the duration and increase the extent of African slavery on this continent. . . . I oppose it," said he, "without condition, and without qualification, at this time and at all times, now and forever." In 1837, at the Whig Convention in Springfield, he was outspoken for the Wilmot Proviso, and said: "We are to use the first and the last and every occasion which offers to oppose the extension of slavery." On the 10th of August, 1848, he said in the United States Senate: "My opposition to the increase of slavery in this country, or to the increase of slave representation, is general and universal. It has no reference to the lines of latitude on the points of the compass. I shall oppose all such extension at all times, and under all circumstances, even against all inducements, against all supposed limitations of great interests, against all combinations, *against all compromises.*"

We need not extend these quotations. They are clear enough as to Mr. Webster's position on all the phases of the slavery question down to his speech delivered in the Senate on the 7th of March, 1850. In that speech Mr. Webster took new ground, which separated him at once from the antislavery men and antislavery organizations with which he had steadily acted for forty years. The speech was an argument to compromise the issues between freedom and slavery on the basis of Mr. Clay's Omnibus Bill, and was in favor of the passage of a new Fugitive Slave Law, against any proviso for keeping slavery away from new territory, and for restraining all antislavery discussion. But what was deemed even worse than the speech was Mr. Webster's wonderful activity in sustaining it. Never before had he come so often before the public, and never before had he been so dogmatic in the assertion of his

views. In one of his dinner speeches he replied to a toast which declared that the perpetuity of the Union depended on the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, and in the course of his remarks he said: "You of the South have as much right to secure your fugitive slaves as the North has to the rights and privileges of commerce." On the subject of free discussion he said: "Neither you nor I shall see the legislation of the country proceed in the old harmonious way until the discussions in Congress and out of Congress upon the subject of slavery *shall be in some way suppressed.*" Instead of the strong and manly declarations against the further extension of slavery that had been so familiar to his lips, he said on the 7th of March that "If a resolution or law was now before us to provide a territorial government for New Mexico *I would not vote to put any prohibition into it.*" He held that the soil, the face of the country, and the climate were a sufficient prohibition, and he would not "re-enact the will of God."

He was terribly severe on "abstractions" and the higher law of conscience, and in his letter of October 28, 1850, to the New York Union Committee, he maintained that "No man is at liberty to set up or affect to set up his own conscience as above the law." And he added, "If we would continue one people we must acquiesce in the will of the majority." On the subject of those compromises, which he had favored in his 7th of March speech, and which had since become the law of the land, he said: "We are to listen to no modification or qualification. They were passed in conformity to the provisions of the Constitution, and they must be performed and abided by *in whatever event, and at whatever cost.*" In his speech at Syracuse, in 1851, referring to the pledges of certain citizens that the Fugitive Slave Law should not be executed, he said: "Depend upon it, the law will be executed in its spirit and to its letter. It will be executed in all the great cities—here in Syracuse, in the midst of the next antislavery convention, if the occasion shall arise. Then we shall see what becomes of their 'lives and their sacred honors.'"

This action on the part of Mr. Webster was felt in all parts of the country. Large numbers of men who had concurred more or less in the growing sentiment against slavery were brought to a pause; clergymen who had been silent preached

against covenant-breaking; merchants who had southern connections took ground against discussion; and the antislavery agitators felt their strength every-where diminishing. They were frantic in their assaults on the great champion of pacification; but more and more the country settled down to a reluctant acceptance of the compromise measures. If any thing had been wanting to show the power of a great mind over the destinies of a country this was the occasion to furnish it. The effect, to use the strong language of Mr. Parker, was "amazing," and, had the South been satisfied with its victory, there is no reason to believe that the peace of the country would have been further disturbed. But the subsequent repeal of the Missouri Compromise in the interest of slavery, just after Mr. Webster's death, renewed the agitation with additional ferocity, and brought on the war.

It is painful to contemplate this great change in Mr. Webster's political position, and still more painful to accept the common theory for its solution, namely, that it was for the sordid purpose of securing Southern support in obtaining the presidential office. Mr. Parker, it must be admitted, expressed the general feeling among antislavery men when he said: "Here is the reason. He wanted to be President. That was all of it. . . . He wanted the office himself. This time he must storm the North and conciliate the South."

There is not, there cannot be, any justification for this extraordinary betrayal of principle, and it must forever remain a blot on the character of this distinguished man. He not only swerved from the course of rectitude which he had hitherto maintained, but, in advocating his new position, he struck at the great foundations of human character, and sought to rule down those elements of manhood which he had so exalted in his Plymouth Rock speech, and which sustained the martyrs in their conflict with the Church, the Puritans in their war against prerogative, and the fathers of the Republic in their determination to pay no duty on tea.

But it may be doubted whether Mr. Parker is entirely right in regard to the motive which wrought this sorrowful and extraordinary change. We may concede that Mr. Webster "wanted to be President;" but how seldom it is that any course in life is shaped on a single motive! And in this case

there were, doubtless, several other motives, and certainly *one*, which was of overruling influence. His love of the Union was an all-pervading motive with Mr. Webster, and prominent in all his activities. Some of the finest and most familiar passages of his oratory are in praise of the Union; and the words, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable," will live as long as this nation lives. In his speech of the 7th of March he exclaims:—

> Secession! peaceable secession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The breaking up of the fountains of the great deep without ruffling the surface! Who is so foolish—I beg every body's pardon—as to expect to see any such thing?

In Mr. Webster's view every national good depended on the union of the States, and hence its preservation was paramount to every thing else.

Then he was in a position to know better than most other men the reality of those dangers which so many scoffed at. The country was in a great convulsion over free California, and the whole South was full of passion, and united as one man. If, therefore, he foresaw what was so soon to take place; if he had a strong conviction of the coming danger, and acted to prevent it; if he believed that it would be better for the North to "conquer its prejudices" than to go to war or to go to pieces, then his conduct would have an interpretation altogether consistent with the general elevation of his life, and without implying the sordid and selfish motive so generally attributed to him. It might imply weakness, but it would not imply corruption.

This, at least, was his own explanation of his extraordinary course of conduct. Mr. Harvey publishes the following extract of a letter bearing on this point, written to a friend in September, 1850, a few months after the delivery of his speech of March 7, on the compromises of the Constitution. He says:—

> Long before General Taylor's death I made up my mind to risk myself on a proposition for a general pacification. I attempted to sound two New England men, but found them afraid.

I then resolved to push my skiff from the shore alone, considering that, in such a case, if I should be foundered there would be but one life lost.

But if Mr. Webster broke himself down to secure Southern support, his failure should be a signal warning to all future politicians; for at the following Whig National Convention (1852) he did not get a single Southern vote. There is no doubt that he was greatly disappointed at this result, and that he felt the nomination of General Scott to be a reflection on his own abilities and services. He consequently warmed toward his old foemen of the Democratic party, who were proud of his association, and were ready to welcome him to their embrace. As is usual in such cases, he was not conscious of any change in himself; but the true state of the case may be inferred from the fact that he advised his friends to vote for General Pierce, and found a new satisfaction in the words of approval which were showered on him by the Democratic leaders. Mr. Harvey tells us of a great party at Franklin, one of his summer homes, which was attended by General Pierce, Isaac Hill, and a host of other New Hampshire Democrats, while only two Whigs were present. This was in the autumn of 1850, and Mr. Harvey says:—

The Democrats of New Hampshire, who had always before treated him with a good deal of coldness and abuse, were very lavish in their attention and kindness. They seemed to have changed. There was a returning warmth and sympathy among them, and he received cordial letters from a good many of them. He received one from Isaac Hill, with whom his relations had been any thing but friendly, asking his pardon, and assuring him of his respects and good wishes.

But the time was near at hand when Mr. Webster was to face his last enemy, and, as we have come to the conclusion that he was not wholly sordid in changing his position in regard to slavery, we shall be the better prepared to consider that religious element in his character which, however obscured by personal frailties and occasional backslidings, was never concealed, although it was generally believed to be more conspicuous in his public teachings than in his private life.

His argument in the Girard College case, which went to

show that there could be no such thing in this country as organized charity without Christianity, is familiar to most clergymen, and is an admirable statement of the Christian system in its bearing on public morals; but it is a professional plea, and would have little weight if it were not consistent with the whole tenor of Mr. Webster's teaching, both public and private. He was a thorough believer in the Christian theory, the divinity of Christ, the immortality of the soul, and the life everlasting. Mr. Parker, in setting forth his religious character, says:—

> He had little religion in the higher meaning of that word, much in the lower. He had the conventional form of religion—the formality of outward and visible prayer; reverence for the Bible and the name of Christ; attendance at meeting on Sunday, and at the "ordinances of religion;" but it is easy to be devout, hard to be moral.

He goes on:—

> He was fond of religious books of a sentimental cast, loved Watts' tender and delicious hymns, with the devotional parts of the Bible. His memory was stored with the poetry of hymn books; he was fond of attendance at church. He had no particle of religious bigotry, joining an orthodox Church at Boscawen, an Episcopal Church at Washington, a Unitarian at Boston, and attending religious services without much regard for the theology of the minister. He loved religious forms, and could not see a child baptized without a tear. Psalms and hymns also brought the woman into those great eyes. He was never known to swear or use any profane speech. Considering the habits of his political company, that is a fact worth notice; but I do not find that his religious emotions had any influence on his life, either public or private.

The end of religion is to regulate the life, and Mr. Parker's intimation is that Mr. Webster's life would not bear a very close scrutiny. But when Mr. Parker's criticism was uttered he was thinking of the 7th of March speech, and the cloud that Mr. Webster's political backslidings had brought over that cause which lay so near his heart; and we must look elsewhere to find whether he was any better for his religion. But it will be safe to infer that a man who regarded the Sabbath, who "was fond of attendance at church," who was so tender as often to have "the woman in his great eye," who was tolerant and forgiving, who was "never known to swear," who had

great "reverence for the name of Christ," and loved the "formality of outward and visible prayer," was not greatly injured by his religion.

The charges of immorality most frequently brought against Mr. Webster are those pertaining to intemperance and carelessness in the use of money. In regard to the last, Mr. Harvey's account of the famous India-rubber Case would seem to show that his neglect in regard to his debts arose more from the pressure that was on him continually than from any disregard of his obligations. Mr. Harvey tells his story as follows:—

In the spring of 1852—the year he died—Mr. Webster was asked to argue the great India-rubber Case which was tried before the U. S. Court at Trenton, N. J.—that of Goodyear *vs.* Day. Day's counsel was Choate, and as Goodyear felt the importance of the suit to him, the legal fees which he should pay seemed a small matter. Mr. Webster was then Secretary of State, and no man occupying such a place had ever before taken a fee and gone into court. He was overworked and in feeble health. The labors of the State Department were heavy and severe, and when the proposition was made to him to go to New Jersey at that warm season of the year to argue a case, it seemed almost an insult. He was, nevertheless, applied to, but said he could not think of it. I had seen Goodyear's agent, who told me that if Mr. Webster would argue the case he would give him a check for ten thousand dollars whenever he should signify his willingness to undertake it, and, if the case was decided in his favor, he would give him five thousand dollars more. I told Mr. Webster of the offer, and, apparently struck with what I said, he replied, "That is an enormous fee. Can he afford it?" My reply was, that it was *his* business, and he was a shrewd man, with every thing now at stake.

"It is a hard thing to undertake," said Mr. Webster. "It is an unfavorable season of the year, and my duties at Washington are pressing; but, really, I do not see how I can forego the fee. This fee I must have, for it will pay fifteen thousand dollars of my debts, and that is what I am striving to do: it is what, if my life is spared, I mean to do. If I can pay my debts I shall die in peace, a happy man. I do not see how I can begin to do it so well as in this way. I shall go and accept the fee."

He did go, received the fee, and won the cause. But he never put one dollar of the money into his own pocket. He appropriated it all to pay his debts—in fact, before it was earned; and I never in my life saw him apparently more delighted than when he received the money. Said he to me: "Three or four more such windfalls as that will let me die a free man: and that is all I live to do."

We leave this statement to make its own impression, and turn for a moment to the other charge. There are many men now living in the city of Washington who will say, if asked, that they have seen Mr. Webster intoxicated, and yet it is extremely doubtful whether they are not deceived. In one case a gentleman says in a note to a friend: "On the day the corner-stone of the south wing of the Capitol was laid he was very much intoxicated; but, after speaking a few words, he seemed to realize his position, straightened up, and delivered a magnificent oration." The question for the reader to settle here, and in all similar cases, is this: How could a man "very much intoxicated" proceed to deliver a "magnificent oration?" The common idea of intoxication implies a derangement of the mental functions from drink, and an outside observer, acting on popular rumor, is quite likely to be mistaken. A little anxious on this point, we addressed a note of inquiry to Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, who is known to have been familiar with Mr. Webster's habits during the last years of his life. His answer is as follows:—

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, March 8, 1878.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of this date has just come to hand. I first became acquainted with Mr. Webster in December, 1843. From that time until August, 1852, two months before he died, I was as intimate with him, perhaps, as any man of my age was with a man of his age. I often dined with him at his own house and at the houses of others; and he often dined with Mr. Toombs and myself when we kept house together. He always drank wine and brandy at dinner, as the other guests or parties did, but I never saw him under the influence of liquor in my life.

Very respectfully,

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS.

Mr. Harvey, in speaking on this topic, holds the same language. He says:—

Of Mr. Webster's daily habits when free from all restraints of company I think I may say without egotism that I know as much as any man; for I was with him a great deal, and, of course, my presence imposed no restraint upon him. He was temperate. He would sometimes take with his dinner a glass of wine or two, but was not in the habit of drinking at other times.

Such testimony does not prove that Mr. Webster was never intoxicated; but it is pretty conclusive as to the point that

intoxication was not his daily habit; and if the weight of testimony should seem to imply that in some of his later speeches he showed signs of over-stimulation, as at Saratoga, Patchogue, etc., it may be accounted for without reflecting on the accuracy of these and similar statements. It is pretty generally known that many public speakers before going on the stand use some form of mental stimulation. Some take tea or coffee, others opium or wine, and one friend told the writer that he never went into court without taking one or two grains of quinine. Mr. Webster used brandy or wine, and, during the pressure of this remarkable season, when so often appearing before the public, it would not be wonderful if he plied his stimulus too freely.

But it does not appear that when at his ordinary labors in Washington, or at Marshfield or Franklin, he was accustomed to drink at any other time than at the table. It is deeply to be regretted that men of such large influence and such generally correct deportment should not totally abstain from these pernicious drinks. The custom of fashionable drinking is the chief obstacle to a general temperance reform, and is, besides, the root of many great evils; but, fortunately, all forms of wrong-doing may be forgiven, and the measure is not "until seven times," but until "seventy times seven."

Mr. Webster associated himself with the Congregational Church at Boscawen early in life, and his name appears to have been borne on some Church roll down to the day of his death; and if his life showed gross backslidings, the charitable belief is that he recovered.

In the year 1802, when he was twenty years old, and about the time that he connected himself with the Church, he wrote: "If I prosecute the profession I pray God to fortify me against its temptations." In 1839 he wrote:—

> I am this day fifty-seven years old. . . . For this uncommon health and all the happiness of a life which has been so far exceedingly happy, I desire to render the most devout thanks to almighty God. I thank him for existence; for the pleasure and glory of rational being; for an immortal nature; and for all the gratifications, the joys, and the means of improvement with which he has blessed my earthly life; for the time and the country in which I have lived; and for those objects of love and affection whose being has entwined with my own.

To his old school-master, in 1851, the year before his death, he wrote: "We hardly know for what good to supplicate the divine mercy. Our heavenly Father knoweth what we have need of better than we ourselves; and we are sure that his eye and his loving-kindness are upon us and around us every moment."

His public and private instructions were in the same vein. At the death of Justice Story he said:—

> Political eminence and professional fame fade away and die with all things earthly. Nothing of character is really permanent but virtue and personal worth; these remain. Whatever of excellence is wrought into the soul belongs to both worlds. Real goodness does not attach itself merely to this life; it points to another world. Political or professional reputation cannot last forever; but a conscience void of offense before God and man is an inheritance of eternity. Religion, therefore, is a necessary and indispensable element in any great human character.

To one of his early friends he wrote: "I am happy to hear of your establishment, and the growth of your fame. You have a little world around you; fill it with good deeds, and you will fill it with your own glory."

These and similar expressions all through the writings and speeches of Mr. Webster are not mere words; they are the outflowings of a full heart and a great nature. Mr. Calhoun, his powerful antagonist through so many years in the United States Senate, said of him: "Of all the public men of the day, there is no one whose political course has been more strongly marked by a strict regard to truth and honor." And, surely, if this was true in relation to his political career it was equally true in his every-day life.

Mr. Harvey tells an interesting story of Mr. Webster's visit to his brother-in-law, John Colby, which has been largely copied in the religious newspapers, but it is so instructive as to the religious bent of his mind that it should receive some attention here. The year before Mr. Webster died Mr. Harvey was spending some weeks with him at Franklin, his native place, and one day Mr. Webster proposed to drive over to Andover, and asked Mr. Harvey to go with him. On the way he explained the object of his visit. John Colby, who had married his half-sister, was living there, an old man, and Mr.

Webster, for reasons which he stated, desired to see him. But here is the account in his own words:—

When I was a lad, living at home, John Colby was a smart, driving, trading, swearing yeoman—money-loving and money-getting. He married my oldest sister. She was a religious, good woman, but beaux were not plenty, and Colby was a fine-looking man. His personal habits were good enough, laying aside his recklessness. He was not a drinking man, and he was, as the world goes, a thrifty man. After he married my sister I went away to college and lost sight of him. Finally he went up to Andover, and bought a farm. After a few years, perhaps five or six, my sister died, and then all the interest that any of us had in him pretty much ceased. Now I will give the reason why I am to-day going up to see this John Colby. I have been told by persons who know, that within a few years he has become a convert to the Christian religion, and has met with that mysterious change which we call a change of heart; in other words, has become a consistent, praying Christian.

The narrative goes on to describe the village, the house, and the venerable Colby, now eighty-five years old, sitting at his front door, with a large Scott Bible spread open before him. Mr. Webster had not seen him for forty-five years, and as neither party knew each other the scene was full of interest; and when Mr. Webster finally told him that he was "little Dan that used to ride his horses to water," an expression of wonder and astonishment came over his face, and he burst out:—

You, Daniel Webster? Is it possible that you have come up here to see *me?* Why! why! I cannot believe my senses! And you are a great man. I read about you every day in the newspapers. But, Daniel, the time is short—you wont stay here long—I want to ask you one question. You may be a *great* man; but are you a *good* man? Are you a Christian man? Do you love the Lord Jesus Christ? That is the only question that is worth asking or answering. Are you a Christian? You know, Daniel, what I have been; I have been one of the wickedest of men. Your poor sister, who is now in heaven, knows that. But the Spirit of Christ, of the almighty God, has come down, and plucked me as a brand from the everlasting burning.

All this, and more, for we have shortened the narrative, was said, says Mr. Harvey, in the most earnest and vehement manner, and Colby concluded by saying: "You have not answered me!" Then Mr. Webster proceeded in his deliberate way to reply. He said among other things:—

I hope that I am a Christian. I profess to be a Christian. But while I say that I wish to add—and I say it with shame and confusion of face—that I am not such a Christian as I wish I were. I have lived in the world surrounded by its honors and temptations; and I am afraid that I am not so good a Christian as I ought to be. I am afraid I have not your faith or your hopes; but still I hope and trust that I am a Christian, and that the same grace which has converted you, and made you an heir of salvation, will do the same for me.

The result of the interview was that Colby asked Mr. Webster to pray with him, and all knelt down together, and Mr. Webster first prayed, and then Colby, the latter, as Mr. Harvey says, "praying for the family, for me, and for every body." On leaving, Mr. Webster said to Mr. Harvey, "I should like to know what the enemies of religion would say to John Colby's conversion! After a long life of wickedness," he continued, "we have seen him to-day, a penitent, trusting, humble believer. Whatever people may say, nothing can convince me that any thing short of the grace of almighty God could make such a change as I, with my own eyes, have witnessed in the life of John Colby."

Mr. Webster's death was not that of a faithful, laborious Christian, living in the daily sunshine of God's love; but it was a death of calmness, resignation, and trust, showing no fear and breathing no doubt. He attended carefully to every thing; had his fine cattle driven by the residence, where he could see them; ordered a light hung to the mast of his fishing yacht, to remain there till he was gone; carefully dictated his will; and when it was done thanked God for "strength to do a sensible act." Then "in a full voice," says Mr. Ticknor, "and with a reverential manner, he went on, and prayed for some minutes, ending with the benediction." And when Dr. Jeffries read to him the hymn beginning, "There is a fountain filled with blood," and ending with "I'll sing thy power to save," he said in a strong clear voice, "Amen! amen! amen!"

Mr. Webster's great intellectual powers are conceded by all his contemporaries; and these, with his peculiar wealth of expression and masterly skill in statement, made him the first advocate and the most finished orator in America. Mr. Everett, in speaking of his oratory, says:—

Of the effectiveness of his manner in many parts it would be in vain to attempt to give any one not present the faintest idea. It has been my fortune to hear some of the ablest speeches of the greatest living orators on both sides of the water, but I must confess that I never heard any thing which so completely realized my conception of what Demosthenes was when he delivered the oration for the crown.

And yet, notwithstanding the munificence and magnificence of his endowments, there was evidently a lack. Mr. Parker charges that he never "originated any thing;" but, while this is an overstatement, it is certainly true that many smaller men had much more to do with striking out courses and making policies than he. Dr. Franklin, with perhaps less capacity of intellect, was far more efficient in all practical reforms. He had a certain executive force that Mr. Webster lacked. If he saw a fault in a street pavement or a State Constitution he was impelled to work out a remedy. When a thought flashed through his mind that electricity and lightning might be the same thing, he had an instinctive impulse to put it to the proof. In mechanics he was an inventor, in philosophy a discoverer, in government a reformer. Mr. Webster had nothing of this. He was mainly a thinker; and he seems to have thought most effectively when charged by others with some duty. Hence his important place was as an advocate, whether at the bar or before the Senate.

As a statesman he acted with a political party, but was not apt to be tied down to a political necessity. He had no political affiliation with President Jackson, but he sustained his proclamation against South Carolina, and was the right hand of the Administration in the contest that followed. In the Department of State he was a splendid negotiator, and his papers are remarkable for a clearness and force which made them irresistible. Mr. Parker says:—

When he spoke he was a great spectacle. His noble form, so dignified and masculine, his massive head, the mighty brow, Olympian in its majesty, the great, deep, dark eye, the mouth, so full of strength and determination—these all became the instrument of such eloquence as few men have ever heard. Many have surpassed him in written words; for he could not embody the sunshine in such flowers as Burke, Milton, or Cicero. But since the great Athenians, Demosthenes and Pericles, who ever thundered out such eloquence as he? He laid siege to the understand-

ing. Here lay his strength. He could make a statement better than any man in America, building a causeway from his will to the hearer's mind. No man managed the elements of his argument with more practical effect than he.

Mr. Webster did not live to see the catastrophe which he had combated and foreshadowed. As yet the conflicting elements were not rife for that struggle which was to try to its utmost the strength of his beloved Union. And nine years later, when it culminated in civil war, and there was no arm strong enough to turn aside the blow, it fell upon us, as he had foreseen, with all the calamities of "States dissevered, discordant, belligerent," of a "land rent with civil feuds, and drenched in fraternal blood." But, thanks to Him "who ruleth in the heavens!" the Union was not permanently destroyed; and the sun of peace shines again, as before, on this great cordon of *United* States. The same flag, "known and honored throughout the world," still floats over every part of our wide domain, "its arms and trophies streaming in their original luster, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a star obscured."

Nay! it is now, more than ever, the ensign of liberty, union, and strength, for its shadow falls on no slave, and the South as well as the North gathers lovingly under its protecting wing. Hence we may say, with even more emphasis than Mr. Webster, that "every-where, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing in all its ample folds as they float over the sea and over the land, is that other sentiment so dear to every American heart—LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER, ONE AND INSEPARABLE."

## ART. VI.—CHRISTIAN PERFECTION AND THE HIGHER LIFE.

*The "Higher Life" Doctrine of Sanctification tried by the Word of God.* By HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D.D., author of "The Apostolical Succession," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1877.

Article on *The Higher Life and Christian Perfection*, in the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* By the Editor, Rev. LYMAN H. ATWATER, D.D. July, 1877.

*A Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection.* In Twenty-four Consecutive Arguments, in which the Doctrine of Sin in Believers is Discussed, and the Proof-texts of Scripture advocating Entire Sanctification as a Second and Distinct Blessing of the Soul after Regeneration, fairly Debated. By the Rev. S. FRANKLIN, M.A., of the Illinois Annual Conference. Cincinnati. 1866.

*The Higher Christian Life.* By Rev. W. E. BOARDMAN.

*The Rest of Faith.* By Rev. ISAAC M. SEE.

*What is it to be Holy?* or, The Theory of Entire Sanctification. An Essay. By Rev. D. W. C. HUNTINGTON, D.D., of the East Genesee Conference. 1869.

*Love Enthroned.* Essays on Evangelical Perfection. By DANIEL STEELE, D.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

*Scripture Views of Holiness.* By W. M'DONALD. Philadelphia: National Publishing Society for the Promotion of Holiness. 1877.

THE various branches of the Christian Church owe it to their common Lord and to each other to cultivate the spirit of love and unity, and to have among them as few points as possible of doctrinal difference. Consequently, when controversy arises out of their misapprehensions of each other's positions, those who see that they are misunderstood should feel bound by their obligations to the cause of religion to correct the mistakes which build needless walls of separation. And where real differences exist, it is sometimes a brotherly thing for each party to set forth, not by way of attack nor of defense, but of explanation, the grounds upon which their beliefs are based. Still, after all has been done that can be done to remove false impressions, there will remain irreconcilable differences of opinion, for which each doctrinal section of the Church must bear its own burden of responsibility.

For our peculiar doctrines as Methodists we offer no apology. We seek no exemption from the most searching examination to which any man desires to subject us, only let the examination be scriptural, fair, and conducted in the right spirit. "Let the righteous smite: it shall be an excellent oil." Our aim in this paper is not to exaggerate the existing diversities of opinion in regard to Christian Perfection, but rather to look for

points of substantial agreement, correcting the errors into which our brethren of other denominations have fallen in regard to the doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and gladly accepting from all sides explanations which tend to bring nearer together God's people of every name.

No doubt, important diversities of opinion exist. We might argue, indeed, that great divergencies are inevitable, seeing that some of the authors named at the head of this article are of "the straitest sect" of Calvinists, and others equally pronounced Arminians, and that the two systems of doctrine are so antagonistic that in matters involving the central ideas of both forms of belief harmony of view is impossible. But this solution fails to explain the facts. No one denomination seems to be unanimous on the subject. Drs. Atwater and H. A. Boardman antagonize Revs. I. M. See and W. E. Boardman as vigorously as they do their Arminian opponents, while Dr. Huntington and Rev. Mr. Franklin, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, come into as sharp collision with Dr. Steele and Rev. Mr. M'Donald as if they did not belong to the same ecclesiastical fold, and that fold one which has been somewhat disposed to boast of its doctrinal unity.

Nor is this inner diversity of judgment in these Churches the evil fruit of any supposed theological anarchy of our own day merely. James Brainard Taylor, fifty years ago, and Samuel Rutherford, two centuries before him, rejoiced in rapturous experiences and a freedom from conscious condemnation, which they expressed in terms and phrases which their Presbyterian brethren are hardly prepared to recommend for general imitation. In like manner, almost in the days of Wesley himself, Jabez Bunting and others dissented from the idea that the innate depravity of the human heart is removed by two distinct and instantaneous processes, one of which occurs at conversion, and the other at some subsequent period, when such second work is made a definite aim, and sought by a specific act of faith.

There are several points upon which all schools of theology agree. One is that the complete sanctification of believers, their perfect deliverance from sin, in every sense of the term, is an integral part of the great plan of redemption. The Methodist theologians argue that, so far as the moral depravity

of the soul is concerned, the work of renewal may be completed during this life. Calvinists in general reason that it must be done at death, but cannot be done till then. Romanists hold that baptism, rightly administered, wholly cleanses the soul from original sin, but that some of the guilt of his personal transgressions clings in most cases even to the believer after his death, awaiting the purifying fires of purgatory.

All Christians agree that the true followers of Christ hate sin, loathe it, abhor it, and struggle, and are in duty bound to struggle for complete deliverance from it. This fact is thus expressed by Dr. Atwater:—

> That the prevalent tone of Christian experience and holy living is quite below the level of scriptural standards and privileges; that there is an urgent call for the great body of Christians to rise to a much higher plane of piety and its visible fruits; that none are so high that they should not make it their supreme endeavor to rise higher; that to struggle onward and upward through the strength, holiness, and grace already attained to yet higher measures of them, so that, receiving grace for grace, they may go from strength to strength toward the goal of sinless perfection whenever and wheresoever attainable; that so there is required the ceaseless effort to get free from sin, and overcome indwelling corruption—are propositions which few will be found to dispute, unless, indeed, some perfectionists dispute the last of them, claiming to have reached entire sinlessness in this life.*

Again, all Methodist writers who have treated of this subject agree with Drs. Atwater and H. A. Boardman, and the Old School Presbyterians generally, in the conviction that in this life no man attains absolute perfection. It is with no manner of hesitation that we concede that it is only in a reduced and modified sense that the term perfection is applicable to any part of the Church militant. Our best obedience here must, in both character and degree, fall far below the standard set before us. The holy law demands the absolute right, in word and deed, in thought and intention, in all obedience, love and devotion. It requires payment of the debt, not only in coin in which there is no trace of alloy, but to "the uttermost farthing." But such service as this can be rendered only where there is a perfect knowledge, not simply of the letter of the divine law, but of the correct practical application of the legal

* "Princeton Review," July, 1877, p. 289.

precept to the endlessly diversified and sometimes hopelessly complicated circumstances and events of daily life. Every good man is conscious that he is often at a loss to know what God and duty require at his hands; and that there are times when his uncertainties in regard to matters of importance burden and distress him. Right and wrong sometimes seem to shade into each other, like the prismatic colors, and the sharpest eye is at a loss to detect the line where the one ends and the other begins. The tenderest conscience will take alarm the soonest, and the better taught will be the least liable to err; but the wisest and the most conscientious have occasion to pause now and then, and wait for clearer light, and perhaps even then wait in vain.

Illustrations of this are not difficult to find in high places. When Paul and Barnabas at Antioch were planning a tour among the Churches, Barnabas had a very positive desire that "John, whose surname was Mark," should accompany them. Paul had an equally decided conviction that Mark ought not to go, seeing that he had "departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work." Neither Paul nor Barnabas would yield; "and the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder, one from the other," Barnabas taking Mark, and sailing for Cyprus, and Paul taking Silas and journeying through Syria and Cilicia. Here one or both of them failed of the absolute right. Either Paul, without being aware of it, was unjust to a fellow-disciple, or Barnabas was ready to imperil the work of the Lord by placing Mark in a position which he was not capable of filling. Very possibly in the sharp contention, παροξυσμός, which occurred, they were really unjust to each other, and thus another feature of wrong was introduced.

If errors of judgment leading to errors of action are thus liable to intervene when the holiest of men are counseling in regard to the holiest of causes, what may we expect of men immersed in the interests, prejudices, and collisions of ordinary social and business life?

But obedience is defective in degree, as well as in character. Justice, truth and love are required toward our fellow-men; but a still higher and nobler service is required at our hands. We are invited to the fellowship of our Lord Jesus Christ, and

communion with God, and called to serve with all our powers, and to the fullest extent of every power, "in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life." And who that ever caught by faith a glimpse of the glory of God —the infinitely great, holy and good—"the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth"—did not bow down in lowliest self-abasement in view of the poor service which he renders? The Christian will never feel in this world that his life is all that he would have it. Though faith may never utterly fail, nor love grow cold, nor obedience be forgotten, nor devotion die, yet the most faithful, devotional, and obedient child of God will humble himself in the dust at the remembrance of his infinite obligations to his Creator and Redeemer, and the poor returns which he is making. Thus, if we assume that the intent is right, and the purpose all-controlling, the service will be imperfect, marred in its character by lack of knowledge and errors of judgment, and deficient in degree; and sinless obedience, in the absolute sense of the term, is utterly impossible.

Thus Wesley reasoned, and thus his followers hold. Consequently, those who argue against "sinless perfection," under the impression that they are antagonizing a doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, fight as those who beat the air. Their arrows, like that of Acestes of old, may show the strong arm and the sounding bow, and flame as they fly, but they hit nothing. Wesley repudiated the doctrine, declaring that he never used the phrase "sinless perfection," lest he should "seem to contradict himself." He steadfastly held that the holiest of men need Christ to atone for their omissions, short-comings, and mistakes in judgment and practice, all of which he pronounces "deviations from the perfect law."

Aside from divine grace, man in this life consists of a ruined soul dwelling in a ruined body. When grace reaches and renews the soul, lifting it up from darkness to light, and from Satan to God, so that it becomes a new creation, the body remains the same "muddy vesture of decay" that it was before the transformation of the spirit. The soul, pent up within, sees "through a glass darkly," the reason less strong and searching, the memory less accurate, the emotions less elevated, deep and

continuous, the whole mental and spiritual action dull, feeble, and slow, compared with what it would be if the material organism were perfect. Consequently, our apprehension of God's word and its revelations of grace and glory are less clear; our sorrow for sin, our grateful sense of pardon, our joy in the Lord, our exultation in the hope of eternal life in heaven, our zeal, activity, and usefulness in God's cause among men, are far below what we would fain have them.

There is still another point, upon which we desire to be fully understood. We do not deny, nor feel the slightest disposition to deny, that so long as we remain in this world, however deep, fervent, and thorough our religious life, there will still be sources of danger within us. There inhere in our nature, as essential elements of it, at least in this present life, appetites, passions, and affections, without which man would cease to be man, and be unfitted for this present state of existence. These, although they are innocent in themselves, nevertheless are simply unreasoning impulses, over which we need to keep constant watch and ward, controlling them by reason, conscience, and divine grace; else they lead to sin and death. When Eve in the garden of Eden "saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise," the temptation was a skillful appeal to elements of her nature which at that time were not depraved, but pure from the hand of the Creator. The desire for pleasant food is not in itself sin; nor is the higher taste, which finds enjoyment in contemplating beautiful forms and colors. Nor can we condemn as wrong the still more elevated instinct of the soul, which delights in mental activity and the acquisition of knowledge. If these instincts and aptitudes had not existed in original human nature, the temptation which Satan presented would have had no power. The deaf adder hears not the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.

The same principle is beautifully illustrated in the trial of Abraham's faith. When the voice came to him, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, . . . and offer him for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of," all the affection which the father bears the child must have risen in mighty opposition to the divine command. This instinctive resistance was not the result of de-

pravity. Abraham would have been below the brutes if he had not felt it in every fiber of his being. It would have been sin in him had he suffered parental affection to sweep away conscience and duty, and plunge him into angry rebellion; but it was not sin for him to yearn with infinite love, pity, and sorrow over his son. We cannot condemn him, nor do we believe that a just and compassionate God condemns him, as he goes up the mountain with a steady step and a fixed purpose, indeed, but with a pallid face and a heart of anguish. Who will condemn him if, when he takes the knife to slay his son, he would gladly have buried it in his own breast, if God would only accept him as a substitute? Faith and fidelity won a great triumph, but the luster of the victory is immeasurably the greater because of the nature of the forces which were overcome.

The illustration of the editor of this Review, derived from the old method of constructing railroads, is as perfect as an illustration can be. The rails were mere flat iron bars spiked upon long timbers laid upon the cross-ties, and now and then the end of a rail, loosened from the wood, lifted itself up, like the head of a serpent, and threw the train from the track. As things were then, the iron bar was an essential part of the railroad. In its proper place, and doing its proper work, it was not only innocent, but wholly useful. Breaking loose from its restraints, and getting out of its proper place, it became a source of danger and a cause of wreck and ruin. Safety required not the abolition of iron rails, but some way of holding them securely in their place.

The thought, we confess, is not a new one. More than a century ago one of the greatest of English thinkers expressed it in an elaborate form. Watson quotes it in his "Institutes" with emphatic indorsement, remarking that, "The following acute observations of Bishop Butler may assist us to conceive how possible it is for a perfectly innocent being to fall under the power of evil." He cites the following passage from the "Analogy:" —

> This seems distinctly conceivable from the very nature of particular affections and propensions. For suppose creatures intended for such a particular state of life, for which such propensions were necessary: suppose them endowed with such propen-

sions, together with moral understanding, as well including a practical sense of virtue as a speculative perception of it; and that all these several principles, both natural and moral, forming an inward constitution of mind, were in the most exact proportion possible, that is, in a proportion the most exactly adapted to their intended state of life: such creatures would be made upright, or finitely perfect. Now, particular propensions, from their very nature, must be felt, the objects of them being present; though they cannot be gratified at all, or not with the allowance of the moral principle. But if they can be gratified without its allowance, or by contradicting it, then they must be conceived to have some tendency, in how low a degree soever, yet some tendency, to induce persons to such forbidden gratifications. This tendency, in some one particular propension, may be increased by the greater frequency of occasions naturally exciting it than of occasions exciting others. The least voluntary indulgence in forbidden circumstances, though but in thought, will increase this wrong tendency; and may increase it further, till, peculiar conjunctions perhaps conspiring, it becomes effect; and danger from deviating from right ends in actual deviation from it, a danger necessarily arising from the very nature of propension, and which, therefore, could not have been prevented, though it might have been escaped and got innocently through. The case would be, as if we were to suppose a straight path marked out for a person, in which such a degree of attention would keep him steady; but if he would not attend in this degree, any one of a thousand objects, catching his eye, might lead him out of it.

So, in the work of sanctification, the various instincts and passions of original human nature do not need to be rooted out of the Christian, but to be disciplined, restrained, chastened, made to obey reason, conscience, and the voice of God. The due enjoyment of pleasant food is not the gluttony which the wise man condemns. A father, in providing for his children, may evince a wise foresight which is by no means the "covetousness which is idolatry." When foul outrage is done to the innocent and the defenseless, we may feel our souls flame with fiery indignation, and be "angry, and sin not." God "setteth the solitary in families" by the instincts and affections with which he endowed man at the beginning, and nothing is more beautiful than the relations which grow out of them, where the divine intent rules, and nothing more debasing and destructive than their abuse.

These instincts and affections being a part of human nature before the fall, no method of theological reasoning is scriptur-

al, no religious discipline is rational, that seeks to purify humanity by their eradication. Simeon the Syrian, hoping to get away from his fellows, the world, and himself, by mounting a pillar—the Romish monk, renouncing the sweet charities of home and friends for his solitary cell, with its skull and hour-glass—are as far from God's idea of holy living as the Hindu devotee on his bed of spikes. These elements of our nature survive the deepest work of grace. When the wondrous change has come to the penitent believer, and he has "put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," it leaves him still human—still nothing less than man The world appeals to him, Satan assails him, and in himself is the tinder which the glancing sparks of temptation tend to kindle. But he may, through the grace of God, offer a steady resistance to every attack, and not fall for one moment into condemnation.

"There is no discharge in that war." Till life itself ends we may expect some form of peril to remain. Forgetting the bounds laid down by law and duty, youth may be given to fleshly lusts, manhood may be ambitious and proud, age misanthropic and avaricious. The innocent appetite to which in Eve the forbidden fruit appealed, may be perverted into the despotic thirst of the inebriate. Her delight in beauty may be the germ from which shall spring a life devoted to mere frivolity and display, and the nobler hunger for knowledge may break away from all authority, and madly labor to reason God out of his own creation. Yet these possibilities of departure from God no more prove the presence of depravity in the Christian than man's freedom to evil as well as good before the fall proves that he was created morally imperfect.

In order to a fair understanding of the case another fact should be stated. As the various Methodist bodies are regarded as the most numerous and prominent advocates and defenders of the doctrine of Christian Perfection, we deem it right to say plainly to its opponents that we are not unanimous in holding it in the precise form in which they generally combat it. Very many of us do not believe that Christian Perfection is a second special blessing, "gained instantaneously by an act of faith," and "not through any process of gradual growth, striving, or advancement toward sinless perfection."

Nor do we believe that the mere fact that a man thinks that he is conscious of having made a complete consecration of himself and all that he possesses justifies him in announcing that a second mighty work of renewal has now been wrought in him.

What is the nature of this act of complete consecration? The reply is, that it is "the laying of all upon the altar." The seeker after a second work bows before God in solemn prayer, and formally consecrates all to him and his service forever. He lays upon the altar life, talents, time, property, wife, children, every thing. But in what sense is all upon the altar? Altars are for sacrifice. Is this a sacrificial act? Does the one who ministers at this altar prepare, like Abraham, to slay his child? Does he leave his home and retire to a monastery? Does he *sell all* that he hath, *and give to the poor?* No, none of these things. What, then, is the practical shape of this act of consecration? It is simply a pious resolution and solemn vow that he will henceforth, by divine help, be a faithful servant of God, and, to the utmost of his powers and opportunities, do the divine will in his business, in his family, in the Church, in public and private, every-where, and at all times.

Such an act is a solemn thing; nor do we wish to underestimate its value. In fact, we do not see how any one can hope for the pardon of his sins till he is ready to make just such a surrender, nor how any one can be living a really Christian life who is not continually renewing this high purpose. So thought Doddridge:—

> "High Heaven, that heard the solemn vow,
> That vow renewed shall daily hear."

Still, when we examine closely we find that this complete consecration is only a formal recognition of our bounden duty, and a solemn renewal of our determination, by the help of God, to faithfully perform it. And, alas! many a resolution of that kind, seeming to "stand as iron pillars strong," fails in the hour of trial. How real our entire consecration is we find out only when the test is applied. And how any Christian, on the strength of a solemn declaration of his good intentions, is authorized, just then and there, to assume the accomplishment of a great and exceptional work of grace in his heart, we con-

fess that we do not see. It seems to us that to teach that any convert of yesterday may at any moment attain the highest grade of Christian experience, if he will only believe that he has it, is to offer a premium for the largest self-conceit, and prepare the way for endless self-deception.

But after all these concessions and explanations, the attentive reader sees that the two great questions involved in the discussion have thus far hardly been touched. They are these:—

1. What scriptural ground is there for the belief that the Christian may in this life be delivered from the moral depravity which he inherited as a member of a fallen race?

2. How far, and in what sense, is it scriptural for the believer to hope that he may in this life be kept by divine grace from the commission of sin?

We are aware that the Arminian Churches and our Calvinistic brethren are so far apart that constant explanations of terms are needed, that we may not wholly misunderstand each other, and that after all possible explanation there will yet remain differences of opinion which are utterly irreconcilable, because they do not end with the particular subject now under consideration, but reach down to the very foundations of our respective systems of doctrine. It is also evident that within the brief limits of a review article little can be done in the way of argument upon matters on which scores of volumes have been written. The utmost we hope to do is to state the different positions held, and explain somewhat the different paths by which they are reached.

In pursuance of this plan, we note the fact that neither Dr. Boardman, in his able book, nor Dr. Atwater, in his able article, draws any sharp line of distinction between depravity and transgression, the enmity of the unrenewed heart to God and the wrong action which that enmity prompts. Like Wesley, they employ the word "sin" to express both, thereby enveloping the whole subject in mist, and rendering the argument unsatisfactory to those who are accustomed to draw the line. Perhaps their omission arises from the courteous habit of stepping lightly when they have occasion to cross a corner of their old denominational battle-field. That it is well to make the distinction, or even necessary, is shown by the fact that many

of those whom Dr. Boardman seeks to refute teach that a residue of depravity is left in believers at conversion, and that the removal of this residue constitutes the beginning of the higher life.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith teaches that there is such a residue. It says that by their transgression our first parents "fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body;" that "the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity," except our Lord Jesus Christ, and that "from their original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."

"The Exposition of the Confession of Faith," published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, adds the following comment: "This is what is commonly called ORIGINAL SIN. Though that phrase is often restricted to the corruption of nature derived to us from Adam, yet, in its proper latitude, it includes, also, the imputation of guilt."

Here the phrase "original sin" is made to include three entirely different things: 1. The guilt of Adam's sin; 2. The depravity of the soul; 3. The damage done to the body. If all these are included, we need spend little breath in discussing the question of perfection of any sort in this life. On this principle there can be no escape for the believer before death, nor at death, nor even after death, till the resurrection. Here the different schools of theology diverge. Arminians do not believe that all the descendants of Adam are accounted guilty, in any proper sense of that word, of Adam's sin. To show that innumerable woes have come upon us in consequence of his transgression proves nothing to the purpose. Children in our own day suffer untold neglect and abuse because of the inebriety of the parent; but this is no proof that God considers them drunkards, and proposes to punish them as such; nor does the dangerous proclivity to alcoholic indulgence which they may inherit furnish, of itself, good grounds for their damnation.

Still another thing ought not to be confounded with moral

depravity. By its union with the body the active powers of the soul itself are dulled and practically lessened, so that as a thinking and emotional being man is smaller and weaker than he would have been had the material nature retained its original perfection. This may be inference only, but it is inferred from numerous and significant facts. Disease in the space of a few days makes the strong man mentally a child; age does the same thing by slower process; yet we cannot believe that disease seizes upon the immortal spirit, or that the soul decays with years. These effects are but the darkening of the windows through which the spirit looks, the dulling of the tools with which it works. It seems reasonable to infer, therefore, that as the body here is not perfect, the soul is hindered and hampered by it, and all intellectual and emotional action is less powerful and complete than it would otherwise be. Nevertheless, we cannot deem these effects sin, nor depravity, in the true sense of the term, inasmuch as they are not matters of choice, and when they are most apparent the whole weight of the reason, the conscience, and the will may be thrown in the right direction.

What, then, is depravity? Would not some confusion of thought be avoided if all could agree to define it as the corruption of the soul, by reason of the fall, "whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil?" Surely the immortal nature suffers through the fall, not only with the body, but as much more seriously than the body as the soul is superior to it. The sorest wound inflicted upon man must be not in his mortal but his immortal being. If the fall affected the body only, then the spirit of the vilest sinner, dying impenitent and hopeless, would enter the other world an angel of light. Moral depravity is as real and positive a quality of the fallen spirit as holiness is of the redeemed and regenerated spirit. This is the element in the natural man which is "not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." This is the evil heart out of which proceed the things which defile the man. This is the evil power which wrests from its proper place, or lifts into monstrous proportions, every natural instinct and passion; which turns love into lust, and natural thirst into the drunkard's despotic appetite, and prudence into avarice, and courage

into murderous violence. So long as this defilement remains it unfits the soul for loyal service here and heaven hereafter, and renders it, in itself, a thing abhorred of God.

Holding steadily to this definition of depravity, the question is, Do the Scriptures encourage us to believe that there is in this life complete deliverance from it? Must the Christian wait of necessity for death to set him free from the enemy which he loathes and hates?

The Presbyterian standards answer thus: "This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part."—*Confession*, chap. xiii. Dr. H. A. Boardman says that sanctification "is a gradual work, and will surely reach its perfection, but only when the pilgrim reaches his heavenly home." He also quotes, with strong approval, the words of Bishop Hopkins, of the Church of England:—

> O, it would be a blessed word of promise if God should say to us concerning our lusts, as Moses did to the Israelites, "Those Egyptians whom ye have seen this day" pursuing your souls, ye "shall see them again no more forever." But no; these Canaanites are suffered to be thorns in our eyes, and scourges in our sides, to sweeten the place of our future rest. When we are most victorious over them, all we can do is to make them subject and tributary: for they have so possessed the fastnesses of our souls that there is but one mortification can drive them out, and that is our dissolution. It was only sin that brought death into the world; and it is only death that can carry sin out of the world.—P. 116.

This looks rather dark for the peace and comfort of the believer, but other quotations are, in a certain way, somewhat more encouraging:—

> It is by the wisdom, not by the impotence, of God that no believer is ever perfect here below. We must know that our old state, with its evil principles, continueth still in a measure, or else we shall not be fit for the great duties of confessing our sins, loathing ourselves for them, praying earnestly for the pardon of them, etc.—Pp. 171, 173.

Bunyan is quoted as having discovered "seven abominations" in his heart, and comforting himself with the reflection; "yet the wisdom of God doth order them for my good."—P. 264.

But do not our opponents confess that their case is in very bad shape, when in order to defend it they are compelled to take the position that the continuance of depravity in the heart and the daily commission of sin are wise and good things? Sin is no remedy for sin. It hardens the heart, dulls the spiritual vision, wars against faith, hope, and charity, and drags steadily downward. The Christian does not need to go on sinning in order to be reminded of the evil of sin and the necessity of pardon. He will sorrow over his past offenses. Although they are pardoned, they still form a part of his history, and not even Omnipotence can remove them thence. Was not Paul forgiven? Yet he humbled himself in the dust in view of the past, declaring that he is "not meet to be called an apostle," because he "persecuted the Church of God." He did not need to continue in that sin, or any other, that he might "be fit for the great duties of confessing his sins, and loathing himself for them." He that sees the glory of a divine hope thrown upon the dark background of the years spent in sin, feels in his heart the joy of a great salvation, and marks the woes and sorrows all about him brought into the world by sin, does not require the aid of present guilt to remind him of the rock whence he was hewn, and the hole of the pit whence he was digged. To argue the utility of the continuous commission of sin is monstrous.

Moreover, the very moment we assume that it is "by the wisdom of God" that Christians remain corrupt, we give a very good reason why they need not be specially humbled by it. Men do not usually feel ashamed to confess that they have not escaped the inevitable nor conquered the invincible. Why should we resist what the wisdom of God directs? "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" If seven abominations are ordered for the good of Bunyan, why not wish for seven more, or "seventy times seven?" Surely the logical positions from which such inferences are possible cannot be sound. Whatever the other may be, this spiritual homeopathy, *similia similibus curantur*, cannot be true. The idea that the Christian must remain corrupt and live in the constant commission of sin, else he will not be "fit for the great duties of confessing his sins, loathing himself for them, and praying earnestly for the pardon of them," is not good sense. It is send-

ing Naaman home to Damascus with a burning patch of his leprosy left upon him, lest he shall forget that "there is a prophet in Israel." It is compelling Lazarus for the remainder of his natural life to wear his grave-clothes and carry about him the noisome smell of decay, to remind him that he has been raised from the dead.

Our opponents have a favorite illustration, which has been used so long that it seems to be regarded by some of them as a powerful argument. The remains of depravity in the heart of a child of God are compared to the Canaanites left in the land of Israel, the history being so recited as to make the impression that it was the divine plan to leave them there for the purpose of holding the people of God to their duty. The simple facts are these: Israel did not need at once the whole of the territory promised them, and therefore the Lord directed them to drive out the inhabitants only as they were prepared to occupy the land themselves. He said to them, "Thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beast of the field increase upon thee." Thus the Canaanites were left in possession of a part of the land *to prove* Israel in the next generation, when the trumpet of war should again be sounded, and Israel march to the conquest of the new territory needed by the growing people. But so far as the Hebrews actually took possession of the land not an idolater was to be left. The express command was to drive them out utterly. "They shall not dwell in the land, lest they make thee sin against me." The promise was, "I will drive out the Canaanite," and there was added the significant warning, "But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then it shall come to pass that those which ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes and thorns in your sides." And this matter, forsooth, is cited to show why God leaves depravity in the hearts of all his children till the day of their death! Strange, that so palpable a perversion of Scripture history should be parroted over and over for centuries by wise and learned men.

But "to the law and to the testimony." Quoting the language of Dr. Boardman, but turning it around to face in the other direction, we, too, exclaim, "We do not want your inferences and speculations. We demand a 'Thus saith the Lord,' in support of your dictum," that a Christian as long as he

lives in this world must have "trouble from his inward corruptions," and go on sinning. The Confession of Faith, which claims direct Scripture authority for all its doctrines, cites four passages in support of its declaration that in this life "there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part." "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." 1 John i, 10. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." Phil. iii, 12. "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind." Rom. vii, 18, 23.

These passages, then, are admitted to be the most direct Scripture authority to be found for the doctrine of the Confession. The evidence certainly is not very strong. The passage from John is nothing to the purpose. To say that "we have not sinned" is by no means the same thing as to declare that we are not this very moment sinning. Paul, referring to the resurrection and reward, declares that, although he has not yet attained, neither is already perfect, he is pressing on "toward the mark for the prize." He evidently speaks of what he elsewhere calls the crown and the glory. But in the very next sentence but one he refers directly to gracious attainments and character, and uses this language: "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded." And we confess that it is with no little surprise we note the fact that Dr. Boardman quotes Paul's disclaimer with emphasis, commending his "beautiful humility," and adding the triumphant conclusion, "Paul is a poor witness for any scheme of perfection in this life," but takes no more notice of the other passage, where exactly the same word is used, than if it had no existence. Nor is this the only omission of the kind? It would seem that the author, in planning his volume, determined to attempt no explanation of the passages in which the words *perfect* and *perfection* are found. We will not undertake to divine the reasons which led to the adoption of this method; but we may be allowed to express the opinion that this is hardly the way to argue doctrinal questions before those who are within easy reach of the Bible Society.

Paul writes to the Romans describing inner conflicts; but learned commentators are divided in their judgments, some

receiving it as a delineation of Paul's present experience, others thinking that it refers to the past, others still concluding that Paul thus represented, in a personal, dramatic way, the experience of awakened sinners in general.

If we make the extreme supposition that Paul confesses that he was living in the constant commission of willful sin, at the time to which he refers, where is the proof that he thus sinned to the end of his life? Where is the proof that James or John, Zacharias or Elizabeth, or Mary, the mother of Christ, at no time of their lives ever had any better experience? Remember, "We do not want your inferences. We demand a 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

If the great exemplars of faith, who will shine the brightest in the day when the Lord "makes up his jewels," never lived an hour without actual sin, who are the "cursed children" whom Peter describes as those who "cannot cease from sin?" And if the passage from John, instead of proclaiming the universal need of a Saviour, is designed to teach that the most faithful servant of God lives in the constant commission of sin, and as long as he lives must war with the depravity of his own nature, how happens it that the very next verse contains one of the broadest, fullest, sweetest promises to be found in all God's word? "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Here but one condition is named, the penitent, believing confession of sin, and two blessed gifts of infinite grace are given, the pardon of sin, and the cleansing of the soul from all unrighteousness.

The pardon is admitted to be bestowed now; where is the cleansing declared to be withheld till the hour of death? Paul prays for the Thessalonians, that they might be "sanctified wholly," and their "whole spirit, and soul, and body" might be "preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Was there any danger that these believers would not be sanctified and blameless after death, and, therefore, Paul intercedes in their behalf? If it refers to this life, is it not a prayer that the Thessalonian Christians may be kept, even here, from all that is properly called sin? Zacharias, filled with the Holy Ghost, blessed the Lord God of Israel for the near advent of the promised Redeemer, through whose mighty

aid we may be "delivered out of the hand of our enemies," and serve God "without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life." This certainly refers to life here, not solely to life hereafter. The "Thus saith the Lord" needed to demonstrate that every Christian, however faithful and devoted, must remain corrupt in heart and soul, and live in the constant commission of sin, properly so called, till his dying hour, cannot be found.

Moreover, the doctrine that "death is the only thing that can carry sin out of the world" is not altogether free from embarrassment. Enoch and Elijah did not die, consequently they were wholly cleansed while living, or not cleansed at all. And at the last day, as Paul assures us, the whole Church of God, who shall be living on the earth, "shall not sleep," but "be changed in a moment," this mortal putting on immortality. And if Enoch and Elijah were wholly purified while living, and all the believers living at the last day shall be, where is the Scripture proof that by the express purpose and direct determination of God not another believer shall in this life be saved from sin, while the world standeth?

The case of Lazarus is still more perplexing. He believed on Jesus. He died, literally and truly. Was he cleansed from all remains of depravity in his dying moments? If not, whither did his spirit go, and where was it during the four days? He was raised again from the dead, not immortal, but mortal, else Christ is not "the first-fruits of them that slept." If his spiritual nature was freed from all depravity at the moment of his death, in what state was it, when he was raised from the dead? Did it remain pure, or did God, restoring him to mortal life, put back the depravity from which he had been cleansed in death? If the soul of Lazarus was corrupt after his resurrection, it is clear either that it was not cleansed in death, or that at the moment of his restoration to life the blessing of purity was rent away from him, and he was plunged again into the mire from whose stains he had just been washed. If he remained clean and white, where is the proof that by the express will and purpose of God he is the only example, since the fall, of this gift among living men, in all human history?

Dr. Boardman cites the "Pilgrim's Progress" as proof that it is the sense of the whole Church that the Christian must

live in sin and sin live in the Christian till his dying hour. We cheerfully admit the evidence of this witness. Those who are called Perfectionists read the immortal dream with as much enthusiasm as their opponents, recognizing the Sloughs of Despond, the Hills of Difficulty, the battles and the wounds, the lights and the shadows, which they have themselves found in the way. It must be confessed, too, that Christian is described as guilty of conduct which, being interpreted, may be understood to represent sin in believers. He falls asleep in dangerous places, and for the sake of a smoother path leaves the right way, falls into the hands of Giant Grim, and narrowly escapes death. Still, Bunyan is careful to show that these wanderings are in every case needless. The reader must be a greater dreamer than Bunyan if he gets only the idea that Pilgrim must of necessity go wrong, now and then, in order to "fit him for the great duties of confessing his sins and loathing himself for them."

Moreover, in making up this argument against the "Perfectionists," how came it to be forgotten that Greatheart goes over the self-same route, and never wanders a step out of the path, never does an act or utters a word that can be construed to represent sin? Christiana and Mercy, too, are fortunate in their pilgrimage, and even the boys never wander from the way, or fall into the hands of the enemy for an hour, except Matthew, the eldest, who, we regret to say, ate some green plums which grew in Beelzebub's orchard, and "was much pained in his bowels, and was with it at times pulled, as it were, both ends together." Let it be noted, also, that they communed with Mr. Holyman, Mr. Honest, Mr. Standfast, Mr. Valiant-for-the-truth, and many a beautiful character represented as spotless in word and deed.

The obvious lesson which the portrayal of Greatheart teaches is that grace, intelligence, courage, and fidelity are able to make the Pilgrim victorious all along the way from the Slough of Despond to the very gates of the Celestial City. As if to prevent all possible mistakes on this point Greatheart, Contrite, and the rest, fall to discussing the conditions of successful pilgrimage, and Mr. Holyman declares that the two great requisites are "courage and an unspotted life."

But while we have our opponents' witness on the stand,

suppose we examine him a little further. The "Holy War" was written for the express purpose of illustrating the work of grace in the soul, and Bunyan, Calvinist as he is, forgets himself so far as to represent Immanuel as driving Diabolus completely out of the city before he will consent to take up his abode therein. When the defenses begin to fail, Diabolus sends Mr. Loath-to-stoop to treat with Immanuel, and secure for him some little spot where he may remain in quiet. The Prince replies: "I will not grant him, no, not the least corner of Mansoul to dwell in: I will have all to myself." "If Mansoul come to be mine, I shall not consent that there should be the least scrap, shred, or dust of Diabolus left behind." Let it be borne in mind that these are the terms of the first surrender, not of some final work of deliverance. Verily, Bunyan's allegories are hardly available for the purpose for which Dr. Boardman quotes them. It is not the first time that the evidence of a witness has proved damaging to the very party that called him into court.

The second question involved in the discussion is, How far and in what sense may the believer hope in this life to be kept by divine grace from the commission of sin?

Dr. Boardman's position is that the Christian must live all his life in the constant commission of sin. In proof of this he cites the Lord's Prayer, the argument being that we are instructed to offer daily the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses;" therefore Christians commit sin daily, otherwise the prayer is needless. Great stress is laid upon this reasoning, and we are informed that "Perfectionists of all schools have been embarrassed by the Lord's Prayer." We never before heard of this general embarrassment. If any *doctor subtilis*, like Duns Scotus, or even more subtle than he, will show us that no one ought to repeat the prayer unless he is conscious that the guilt of unpardoned sin rests upon him; that it is wrong for any man to repeat it unless he has willfully sinned against God, since he prayed the last time previously, then we will confess that there may be cases where we need to pause and consider what to do. For instance, if the Sabbath-school closes with the Lord's Prayer, and the regular Church service, ten minutes afterward, begins with it, we can imagine some saint of lofty stature, like Enoch, or Elijah, or Zacharias, or

Elizabeth, living, by the mighty power of God, through that period of ten minutes without the willful commission of sin, and so having no present willful sin to confess.

But no subtle doctor has attempted the demonstration, and no such construction can be forced upon the prayer. The believer, who knows that he has "passed from death unto life," who feels that his sins are all forgiven, may offer the prayer, humbly and sincerely, in perpetual recognition of the fact that he is a sinner saved by grace, by the pardoning love of God, and the atonement of Christ; that the best service which he renders is a poor service, marred by ignorance and weakness; and that it is only through the infinite mercy of God that he has a good hope of eternal life. Surely there is meaning in the prayer where there is no sense of sins unforgiven.

Indeed, if embarrassment is to be felt anywhere, it looks to us as if our Calvinistic brethren have the best title to it. The Confession of Faith informs us that "God doth continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified," and that they "can never fall from the state of justification." If this be true, then they must be forgiven in advance, or, at the latest, at the very moment of their sinning. If pardon lags five seconds after the sin the sinning believer is, for the space of five seconds, in a state of condemnation. The "Exposition of the Confession" declares that the sins which believers "afterward commit cannot revoke the pardon which God has graciously given them." Whitefield expressed it thus: "One act of faith forever and forever justifies." If this be so, what becomes of Dr. Boardman's argument? On this principle a believer's sins are forgiven before he has time to pray for pardon. The sin and the pardon must occur exactly at the same instant of time, else the believer for a certain period, whatever it may be, falls into condemnation. Why say, "Forgive us our trespasses," if they are already forgiven? They are forgiven, too, before there is time to repent of them, or form a resolution to forsake them. What use, then, has a believer for the Lord's Prayer, even if he knows that he is living in the constant commission of sin? If he is logically consistent with the doctrine stated, he may burst out in exultant thanksgivings that no sin committed now can "revoke the pardon" given him in the day of his justification; but he has no more reason, logically, to pray for the

pardon of the sins of to-day than for the subsidence of Noah's flood.

But in what sense do Arminians hold that believers may be kept by the power of God from the commission of sin? We believe that the provisions and promises of the Gospel extend thus far, that they authorize the Christian to look for grace that shall keep him from choosing sin, from committing offenses which destroy present peace and imperil the soul. As John Wesley defines it, believers may be kept from "voluntary transgressions of known law." We have already stated in explicit terms that the obedience of the most devoted Christian, measured by the standard of absolute right, is found defective at every point. When we say, therefore, that men may live free from the sins which bring into condemnation, we are brought face to face with what seems to some a formidable objection.

We are accused of cutting down the law in order to make sinless obedience possible. Wesley remarks that unavoidable errors and mistakes, though they are deviations from the perfect law, and so need the atonement, do not bring the believer into condemnation, and therefore, for the sake of accuracy of speech, ought not to be confounded with offenses willfully and knowingly committed. Dr. Atwater quotes his language, and exclaims, "Out upon such casuistry!" Nevertheless, there is such a distinction. Man may be unable to draw the line, but the eye of God sees it. The great Teacher himself makes a difference between the servant who knows his Lord's will and the one who knows it not. The Levitical law made a broad distinction between sins of ignorance and those committed *presumptuously*. For the one class there was atonement, for the other there was none. Human law often inquires after intentions. To slay a man is not always murder; mistaken evidence is not always perjury. Loose definitions and careless applications may work evil; nevertheless, the principle exists.

Wesley never taught that where any degree of ignorance is involved all offenses are sinless. There are cases where ignorance is itself a grievous sin. The watchman on the railroad who knows that the express train is approaching, but does not know whether the track is rightly placed or not, and is too in-

dolent to go and see, and thus perform the duty for which he is paid his daily wages, is guilty of criminal neglect. But suppose that he goes with his lantern and finds that one switch is in position and securely locked, and then goes to examine the other a hundred rods away, and while he is gone thieves, hoping for plunder, wrench off the lock and throw the rails out of position, is he guilty, in the sight of God or man, if he boldly swings his signal and shouts, "All right!" while the train thunders on to its destruction?

Wesley, reasoning as an Arminian, held that after true conversion a man may so offend against the divine law as to forfeit peace with God, and fall again into condemnation. But offenses, he thought, may be committed against the letter of the law under circumstances which do not involve the same fatal consequences. These last, he judges, ought somehow to be distinguished in terms from the others; and for this Dr. Atwater cries, "Out upon such casuistry!" and declares it redolent of Antinomian heresy. Another writer even sees in it an adoption of the Romish distinction between venial and mortal sins.

But let us look before we leap to a conclusion. Which of these two systems of doctrine savors of Antinomianism, or tends toward Rome? The one reasons that, while the humble, earnest believer, who trusts in Christ as his only hope, and is trying with all his heart to do the divine will, may fail to meet the requirements of a perfect law, his inevitable mistakes and deficiencies do not bring him into condemnation, yet that a single transgression of the divine precept, known at the time to be sin, involves his soul in peril, and is a step toward eternal death. The other teaches that in justification the pardon of all sin, past, present, and future, is secured; and that, although it may provoke God's "fatherly displeasure," and even bring temporary chastisement, no sin committed after conversion, however foul and deliberate, can for one moment bring the soul into condemnation, or impair in the slightest degree its title to heaven. So far as the ultimate salvation of the soul is concerned, the difference between Wesley and Calvinism is that what Wesley concludes in regard to the believer's involuntary infractions of the perfect law Calvinism affirms in regard to all manner of deliberate sin.

In regard to the charge of imitating Romish error, dividing sin into two classes, the venial and the mortal, our Calvinistic brethren seem to us far more deeply involved than we in that condemnation. Rome teaches that there are mortal sins into which the believer may fall, and thereby bring upon him the wrath of God and the peril of eternal death. Other sins, which Rome calls venial, involve a certain degree of guilt, which demands punishment for a limited period, but does not ultimately forfeit heaven. How far does this latter class of offenses differ from the sins committed after justification, as defined by the Confession of Faith?

"God doth continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified; and although they can never fall from the state of justification, yet they may by their sins fall under God's fatherly displeasure, and not have the light of his countenance restored unto them until they humble themselves, confess their sins, beg pardon, and renew their faith and repentance."—Chap. xi. The chief difference between the two seems to be that Calvinism includes greater degrees of guilt, and locates its Purgatory on earth, while Rome threatens a worse punishment for smaller offenses.

But these *argumenta ad hominem* do not settle the question. "To the law and to the testimony." Against the theories and reasonings of men we set the numerous declarations of God's word. He that believes in Christ is, according to the Scriptures, "a new creature;" he has "put off the old man with his deeds," and has "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." He is said to be "free from sin;" he is said to be "sanctified" and "holy," and is called a "saint," while the blood of Christ "cleanseth" him "from all sin." In regard to the Christian's daily life, God declares that he is faithful, and will not suffer him to be "tempted above" that he is "able," but will "make a way of escape." He cheers the hearts of his servants in their warfare by a blessed promise of universal application, "My grace is sufficient for thee." Commands to be holy, exhortations to be holy, prayers that God's people may be holy, and promises of grace to help them to be holy, are found on almost every page of holy writ.

We are told, too, that a state of grace which God himself

calls *perfection* is attainable in this life. Christians are exhorted to "grow in grace, grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ." They are assured that apostles and prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, are given "for the perfecting of the saints, . . . till we all come in the unity of the faith, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." The means of this growth are named. "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." "All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God, . . . that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work."

There is, then, by the word of God, a ripeness and roundness of Christian character which bear the same relation to the new life that the full corn in the ear bears to the springing blade. One Bible name for this spiritual maturity is *perfection*. Thus Noah and Job are said to be "perfect." Paul writes: "Let us, as many as be perfect, be thus minded," and we are exhorted to "mark the perfect man," for his end "is peace." In scores of passages the word "perfect" is employed to describe the character and conduct of living men; and the closest critical examination of the original language in nowise impairs the force of the term. Our opponents know this as well as we, but say that as the exemplars of faith, both in the Old Testament and the New, sometimes lapsed from this standard, we must explain away these strong expressions, or construe them as delineations of the work of sanctification, as it will be when completed at death.

There is a third interpretation, which we prefer to either of the methods named, because it seems more natural, and more in accordance with the general tenor of God's word. We believe that these passages describe the thoroughness of the work wrought at conversion, and the continuous victories of the new life to which the Christian is called. They affirm that it is his blessed privilege, through the infinite grace of God vouchsafed him every moment, to live at this level, free from the willful offenses which bring into condemnation; and that, if he fails to do it, it is not because divine grace is insufficient for him, but because in the freedom of his own will he yields to temptation, where, at the very moment of his fall, he ought to stand, and might stand.

Consequently, when one who has borne every mark of a child of God lapses into open sin, we do not infer that he was a hypocrite, or that his conversion left him in so helpless a state that nothing better could be justly expected of him. Nor do we infer that he fell because just at that time God let go of him, in order to show him that in himself he was helpless. We do not look upon David's adultery and murder, and Solomon's idolatry and debauchery, with a sort of devout wonder, marveling that such things should form a part of God's wise designs. We condemn them, utterly and totally, as things that neither ought to be nor need to be. We say that David and Solomon sinned against God and their own souls, forfeited the divine favor and their title to eternal life, and that if they had died in the state they then were they would have been eternally lost. We affirm that every sin into which a man knowingly and willfully ventures after his conversion imperils his immortal soul. We reason that the fearful falls of good men recorded in the Scriptures are not proofs of the incompleteness of the work of renewal, or that the continuous commission of willful sin must stain the life of the most devoted child of God till the hour of his death. They are proofs, rather, that conversion does not end probation; that possibilities of failure still remain, and that it behooves every man, whatever advance he may have made in divine things, to "keep his body under, lest that by any means he should be a castaway."

Here we see the fact noted at the beginning, that the Calvinistic and the Arminian systems of doctrine are so diverse that what is accepted as a logical process by the adherents of the one may be utterly rejected by the other. Both parties admit, what, alas! cannot be denied, that after a man has become a true child of God he may fall into grievous sin. From this point we diverge. The Arminian believes that the fallen one is in imminent peril; that to choose sin consciously and willfully is to forfeit God's favor, and fall again into condemnation; and while God may, in infinite mercy, still strive with him by his Holy Spirit, and call upon him to return, it is possible for the fallen one to turn a deaf ear to the voice of love, and die eternally. The Calvinist holds that sin may bring God's "fatherly displeasure" upon the erring child, and even sore chastisement; nevertheless, the worst of sins cannot bring him

again into condemnation, nor revoke the pardon given him when he first believed, nor for one moment endanger his eternal salvation. These totally opposite views of the possible consequence of sin committed after conversion grow directly out of the two different doctrinal systems, and neither party can give way without bringing their whole edifice into logical wreck.*

---

## ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1878. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Protestant Theory of Church Genesis. 2. La Salle and the Jesuits. 3. The Syriac Ferial Office. 4. Catholic Poetry of the English Language. 5. The Plantation of Desmond. 6. Sixtus V. 7. Socialistic Communism in the United States.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1878. (Andover.)—1. Isocrates. 2. Christ and Paul. 3. Erasmus Darwin. 4. Succoth and Penuel not yet Identified. 5. On the Latin Equivalent of the Name in Luke ii. 2, translated Cyrenius. 6. Future Punishment of the Wicked as Revealed in the Old Testament. 7. The Meaning of יהוה. 8. Illustrated Sermons, or Truth Addressed to the Eye.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, July, 1878. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Apparition at Endor. 2. The Ethiopic Book of Baruch. 3. The True Position of the Lutheran Church in Relation to the Authority of Human Creeds, before the Publication of the Form of Concord, in 1580. 4. History of the Hebrew Translation of the New Testament. 5. Objections to the Cause of Ministerial Education Considered. 6. Course and Character of Emigration, and What Per Cent. is Available to the Lutheran Church. 7. Of the Use of the Sacraments.

NEW-ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, July, 1878. (Boston.)—1. Biographical Sketch of the Hon. Henry Wilson. 2. Henshaw's Account of the Stamp-Act Riot. 3. Record from the Leonard Family Bible. 4. Autobiography of William Rotch. 5. Robert Campbell and his Descendants. 6. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison. 7. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown, Mass. 8. Genealogy of the Woodbridge Family. 9. Bryent's Winnepesaukee Journal. 10. Longmeadow, Mass., Families. 11. Prison Ships and Old Mill Prison. 12. Inventory of the Estate of Thaddeus M'Carty, of Virginia. 13. Pedigree of Haynes of Coppord Hall. 14. Taxes under Gov. Andros. 15. Abstracts of Earliest Wills in Suffolk County, Mass. 16. Descendants of Edward Shepard. 17. Parkers of America. 18. A Relic of Cromwell.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, July, 1878. (Baltimore.)—1. The Christian Cosmos. 2. Fifty Years of My Life. 3. Edwards on the Will. 4. Progress in Human Thought. 5. The Telephone and Phonograph. 6. The Greek Church. 7. Literature and Style. 8. Celibacy in the Christian Church. 9. Dr. Dabney and Dr. Bledsoe. 10. The Rock of our Salvation.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1878. (Boston.)—1. The Medieval Puritans and Universalists. 2. Lewes' Physical Basis of Mind. 3. Christianity in the Suppression of Gladiatorial Games. 4. The To-morrow of Death. 5. The St. Albans Raid: An Episode of the Rebellion. 6. The Book of Enoch and the Apocrypha. 7. German Universities.

---

* For any specialties of opinion in this article the author is responsible.—ED.

NEW ENGLANDER, July, 1878. (New Haven.)—1. Reaction of New England on English Puritanism, in the Seventeenth Century. 2. A Critical Examination of the New Testament Teachings with Respect to the Office of the Holy Spirit. 3. The Pacific Railroads and the Government. 4. A Dangerous Principle in Congregationalism. 5. What shall we do with our Tramps? 6. How to Deal with Communism. 7. Shall Incomes be Taxed? 8. Nihilism in Russia, as it appears in the Novels of Ivan Turgénieff.

September, 1878.—1. Chauncey Wright as a Philosopher. 2. Thorough Personal Preparation in Sunday-School Work. 3. The Student in American Colleges. 4. Reaction of New England on English Puritanism in the Seventeenth Century. (Second Article.) 5. The Pacific Railroads and the Government, (Second Article.) 6. The Japanese, as Compared with the Roman Family. 7. The Ancient and the Modern Jew. 8. Religious Education of the Colored People of the South.

The article on "Religious Education of the Colored People of the South," by Colonel J. T. L. Preston, of Lexington, Virginia, is one of the most refreshing tokens of the quarter. It is written by a genuine son of the South, whose military title indicates that he fought on the Confederate side in the civil war, but his unsectional, unsectarian spirit of religion and philanthropy is limited by no latitudes or longitudes. As a statesman and a Christian he recognizes the momentous importance of raising the colored people of our country into a due fitness, as educated Protestant freemen, for the exercise of their duties as citizens. He recognizes the great movement of evangelical denominations in the North, which pours forth treasures and labors and sacrifices for this purpose, to be, what it truly is, a result of the most deeply Christian impulse. So long and so constantly have our Southern brethren maligned this movement, talking as if there were a terrible oppression in bestowing schools, colleges, and churches and moneys upon the Southern section, that we welcome Colonel Preston as a harbinger. Wise, liberal, Christian, patriotic men in the South are coming to the front. We of the North too must not forget that it is not so many years (we, personally, remember it well) since Prudence Crandall was prosecuted and imprisoned in jail for establishing a colored school in Connecticut. The pages of the New Englander are just the place for the Virginian; and the combination recalls to mind the day, so beautifully described in the great speech of Daniel Webster, when Massachusetts and South Carolina stood side by side, and Washington's great arm leaned upon them both alike.

## *English Reviews.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW. July, 1878. (London.)—1. How is Sin to End? 2. Pope Pius IX. 3. On Serfdom in Scotland, and its Connection with the Early Church. 4. Two Scottish Ecclesiastics: Robert Buchanan and Alexander Ewing. 5. The Yale Lectures on Preaching. 6. Review of Recent Literature on the Criticism and Interpretation of the New Testament. 7. Review of Literature on Church History for the Year 1877.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July 1, 1878. (London.)—1. Taine's Philosophy of Art. 2. Ethics of Evolution:—The Nature of Evil, and the Genesis of Conscience. 3. Bryan Waller Proctor. 4. The Russian and Turkish War. 5. Future Punishment. 6. Recent History of the Burials Question. 7. The Later Greek Nation. 8. The Congregational View of Religious Communion.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1878. (London.)—1. Modern Aspects of Christian Evidence. 2. Burma, Past and Present. 3. A New Way of Writing English History. 4. Sir Robert Aytoun. 5. The Annexation of the Transvaal Territory. 6. The Book of Job. 7. The Science of Health. 8. Foxe's Book of Martyrs.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1878. (New York.)—1. The House of Lords. 2. The Mythology and Religious Worship of the Ancient Japanese. 3. The Saracens in Italy. 4. The late Yakoob Beg of Kashgar. 5. George Eliot as a Novelist. 6. The Peasants of our Indian Empire. 7. Russia Abroad and at Home.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1878. (New York.)—1. Marquess Wellesley's Indian Administration. 2. The Remains of Edmund J. Armstrong. 3. Lecky's England in the Eighteenth Century. 4. Origin and Wanderings of the Gypsies. 5. Primitive Property and Modern Socialism. 6. M. Doudan's Letters. 7. Russia and Roumania. 8. The Gold Mines of Midian. 9. Finlay's History of the Servitude of Greece. 10. The Constitution and the Crown.

Comparative philology has been essaying to pour light on the history and origin of the gypsies. The following paragraph narrates spiritedly

### THE FIRST NOTICEABLE APPEARANCE OF THE GYPSIES IN WESTERN EUROPE.

Late in the year 1417 the Hanseatic towns on the Baltic coasts and at the mouth of the Elbe were startled out of their commercial propriety by a novel and fantastic apparition. A horde of swarthy and sinister figures, in aspect and manners strangely unlike any samples of humanity which had till then come within the range of the worthy burghers' experience, suddenly appeared before the gates, first of Luneburg, then successively of Hamburg, Lübeck, Wismar, Rostock, and Straslund. They were, the chroniclers inform us, uncouth in form as well as hideous in complexion, and their whole exterior betokened the lowest depth of poverty and degradation. The wretchedness of their plight was rendered more conspicuous by the bizarre fragments of Oriental finery with which it was sought to modify or conceal it. An ample cloak, draped in classic fashion, and striped with gay colors, which, though half obliterated by time and travel, still recalled the fabrics of Tunis or Damascus, usually disguised the filth and

raggedness of their remaining apparel. Even when this relic of dignified costume was absent, a gaudy handkerchief or brilliant cockade never failed to denote the grotesque solicitude of these singular strangers for the adornment of their unprepossessing persons. The women and young children traveled in rude carts, drawn by asses or mules; the men trudged alongside, casting fierce and suspicious glances at those they met from underneath their lowering brows; the elder children, unkempt and half-clad, swarmed in every direction, calling with shrill cries the attention of the passers-by to their uncommon feats of jugglery and legerdemain.

At the head of this motley caravan rode two principal leaders, followed by a train of minor dignitaries. They were pomposnly mounted on gayly caparisoned horses, and all the insignia by which the baronial rank was at that period distinguished were parodied in their trapping and accouterments. It was observed, however, that the hounds which their attendants held in leash showed more eagerness to worry the peaceful inmates of the farm-yard than to chase the wild denizens of the forest; and their masters were quickly suspected of entertaining a livelier taste for domestic rapine than for field sports. These nondescript chieftains styled themselves "Dukes of Little Egypt," and called their followers *Secane*, a word quickly transformed by Teutonic pronunciation into its modern representative, *Zigeuner*. Among the lower orders, however, the new arrivals were long familiarly known by the appellation of "Tartars," which, in those days of rough-and-ready classification, was in Germany applied indiscriminately to all nomad tribes.—Page 60.

These were an exploring body of a few thousand in advance, and, as they were able to move with surprising celerity, they appear at a great variety of points in Europe during the ensuing decades.

As to the origin of these tribes popular theories only tell us what it was not. "One theory recognizes them as descendants of the wandering votaries of Isis; another identifies them with the 'mixed multitude' which followed Israel out of Egypt. According to one view, they fled from Bactria before the incursions of the White Huns and Afghans; according to another, they turned westward on the fall of Babylon; according to a third, they entered Egypt with the Mamelukes. These are, moreover, but specimens, and by no means the least favorable that could be produced, of the random notions which have prevailed even among thoughtful men on this point. We will not trespass upon our readers' time and patience by stopping to expose the fallacies on which these loose conjectures

severally rest. Not an iota of real evidence can be adduced in favor of any one of them, and historical research would become an empty phrase if such crude imaginings were to pass current as rational hypotheses."—Page 64.

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE OF ORIGIN.

We can say with confidence that the people whose name, *Gypsy*, in several European languages, including our own, implies an *Egyptian* descent, have at no time entered into collective relations with the dwellers in the land of Pharaoh. Gypsies are indeed found in Egypt, as in almost every other part of the habitable globe, but under the same conditions as elsewhere. They are alien wanderers by the shores of the Nile, as they are along the banks of the Thames, and their dusky tents are equally foreign to the soil when they blot the yellow sands at the base of the Great Pyramid and when they are pitched on the greensward beside Melrose and Stonehenge. It is certain that if the gypsies had approached Europe by way of Egypt some Coptic admixture would have penetrated into their speech. This not being the case, we unhesitatingly conclude that their route must have lain in a different direction. On the other hand, from the fact that, of the thirteen European dialects of Romany, all without exception contain a well-marked Greek element, the inference is obvious that the entire body, previous to their dispersion through the rest of Europe, halted during some considerable time among a Greek-speaking population. On the same principle, when an analysis of the English gypsy tongue discloses the existence of Slav, Magyar, German, and French ingredients, side by side with the invariable Greek constituent, all flung pell-mell into the original Indian receptacle, we are justified in asserting that the gypsies of England must, at some stage of their wanderings, have lived in countries where these various languages were severally spoken. By similar reasoning we arrive at a corresponding conclusion in the case of each of the other European tribes. We can even go one step farther. The common stock of gypsy speech is found to contain a certain number of words unmistakably Persian and Armenian; and, guided by this unerring indication, we are enabled to follow these mysterious nomads backward along two stages of their long Asiatic pilgrimage. Thus, their language not only betrays their Indian origin, but reveals a sojourn on the table-lands of Irak and Anatolia, a prolonged halt in the Grecian peninsula, and records the subsequent intercourse of each separate horde with the different European nations.—Page 65.

The fundamental Romany idiom, when stripped of the miscellaneous foreign overgrowths which, in different countries, variously conceal its true form, is found, notwithstanding its present degraded condition, to belong by hereditary right to a highly aristocratic family of languages. The pedigree of this Plantagenet

in rags is decipherable in the complex grammatical structure and elaborate phonetic system inherited, at least collaterally, from the most ancient and illustrious of Aryan tongues. Romany stands in precisely the same relation to Sanskrit as the living languages of northern India, and is, in every respect, strictly co-ordinate with them. The analogy is, indeed, so close that it has been ranked as an eighth beside the seven representative forms of speech selected by Mr. J. C. Beames* as the most widely diffused and characteristic among the numerous Aryan dialects spoken south of the Himalayas. It is, then, certain, not only that they sprang from the same source, but that they were developed under the same conditions and in one common home, which can have been no other than the peninsula of Hindustan.—Page 66.

LINGUISTIC PERIOD OF THE GYPSY ORIGIN.

There is a portentous gap in our acquaintance with Indian tongues between the disappearance of the Prâkrits, or intermediate idioms, about the beginning of our era, and the emergence, with the poet Chand, in the twelfth century, of the modern analytical dialects. In the interval a radical change had taken place. Phonetic decay had worn down the Old-Indian case suffixes until they were no longer fit for service, and dialectic regeneration had stepped in to supply the deficiency by expedients of its own choosing. Now Romany agrees with the New-Indian languages, not only in the general principle of their inflection, but also in the particular means employed for the purpose; and it may, therefore, be looked upon as certain that its separation from the parent stock occurred subsequently to the formation of those languages. But we have already seen that the *data* are wanting which would have enabled us to fix this period definitively. Nevertheless, Dr. Miklosich, after careful consideration, believed himself able to indicate approximately the year 1000 A.D. as the probable epoch of the dispersion of the gypsies.—Page 67.

HISTORIC CONJECTURE OF GYPSY ORIGIN.

Philology identifies the Gypsies with the Lûrys or Jats, of whose origin the following account is given:—

In the great Persian Epic, the "Shahnameh," or "Book of Kings," Firdusi relates an historical tradition to the following effect. About the year 420 A.D., Behrâm-Gûr, a wise and beneficent ruler of the Sassanian dynasty, finding that his poorer subjects languished for lack of recreation, bethought himself of some means by which to divert their spirits amid the oppressive cares of a laborious life. For this purpose he sent an embassy to Shankal, King of Canoj and Maharajah of India, with whom he had entered into a strict bond of amity, requesting him to select from

* Hindi, Marathi, Bengali, Sindhi, Panjabhi, Gujarati, and Orya. A Comparative Grammar of Indian Languages. London: 1872.

among his subjects, and transmit to the dominions of his Persian ally, such persons as could, by their arts, help to lighten the burden of existence, and lend a charm to the monotony of toil. The result was the importation of twelve thousand minstrels, male and female, to whom the king assigned certain lands, as well as an ample supply of corn and cattle, to the end that, living independently, they might provide his people with gratuitous amusement. But at the end of one year they were found to have neglected agricultural operations, to have wasted their seed-corn, and to be thus destitute of all means of subsistence. Then Behrâm-Gûr, being angry, commanded them to take their asses and instruments, and roam through the country, earning a livelihood by their songs. The poet concludes as follows: "The Lûry, agreeably to this mandate, now wander about the world in search of employment, associating with dogs and wolves, and thieving on the road by day and by night."

These words, written more than eight centuries and a half ago, accurately describe the condition of one of the nomad tribes of Persia at the present day. Their name, which has continued unchanged since the time of Firdusi, probably means "street-singers," and they must not be confounded with the settled inhabitants of Luristan, the principal haunt of the vagrant Lûry being Kurdistan. They have been commonly identified by travelers as members of the gypsy family, and Sir Henry Pottinger's description of those encountered by him in Beloochistan strongly countenances this view.

"The Loories," he writes, "are a class of vagabonds who have no fixed habitations, and in many other respects their character bears a marked affinity to the gypsies of Europe. They speak a dialect peculiar to themselves, have a king to each troop, and are notorious for kidnaping and pilfering. Their favorite pastimes are drinking, dancing, and music, the instruments of which they invariably carry along with the fraternity, which is likewise attended by half a dozen of bears and monkeys, that are broke in to perform all manner of grotesque tricks. In each company there are always two or three members who profess an insight into the abstruse sciences of Ruml and Qoorua, besides other modes of divining, which procure them a ready admission into every society, among a people who believe so firmly in predestination."—P. 68.

### What drove the Jats westward?

It was from the Ghaznevide conqueror and at home that the independence of the Jats received its death-blow. The victorious army of Mahmoud, when returning laden with spoil from the Somnauth expedition of 1025, was attacked and pillaged by them on the banks of the Indus. Their temerity was chastised with exemplary rigor. Broken and dispersed by the resistless arms of the Sultan of Ghazni, they were not, however, annihilated, and the Jat tribe still forms the staple of the Sikh population in the Pun-

jab, as well as the majority of the cultivators and cattle-breeders of Sinde. . . .

We have seen that, from linguistic considerations alone, this event has been assigned to a period not far from the year 1000 A. D. In 1025 occurred, as already mentioned, the overwhelming disaster inflicted on the Jats by the retributive arms of the Ghaznevide Sultan. The inference can scarcely be resisted that the two circumstances were linked together as cause and effect, and that the wanderings of the gypsies in Europe are but the expiring reverberations of the great blow struck many centuries ago at their ancestors in the Punjab.—Pp. 69, 70.

Gypsy prospects:—

There can be no doubt that their contact with European peoples has been productive of innumerable evils to European society. Society vainly endeavored to defend itself by proscription and persecution. In England, in the reign of Elizabeth, it was "felony without benefit of clergy" to be seen for one month in the fellowship of the "outlandish people calling themselves Egyptians." In France, the States of Orleans decreed in 1561 that they should be proceeded against with fire and sword. In Spain they were banished by repeated edicts under the severest penalties. In Italy they were forbidden to remain more than two nights in the same place. In Germany they were shot down like wild beasts. They were persecuted in England as harborers of Jesuits; they were denounced in Germany as spies of the Turk; in Spain they were accused of driving with the Moors a nefarious traffic in Christian children; in Turkey they are still believed to be devourers of human flesh. Some of these imputations were absolutely false; some were grossly exaggerated. All were readily believed, and vigorously acted upon, but to no purpose. The race,

"More outcast and despised than Moor or Jew,"

throve and multiplied exceedingly, each generation inheriting from its predecessor a more irreconcilable aversion to settled life, and a deeper hatred of the communities which they infested and which spurned them.

In the last century, however, a change came over the spirit of several European Governments in their regard. Maria Theresa in 1768, and Charles III. of Spain in 1783, took measures for educating and training these poor wanderers in habits of Christian morality and continuous industry. The upshot was sufficiently satisfactory to encourage the imitation of their example, and the same experiment is now being tried in Russia with signal success; while the recent emancipation of the Wallachian gypsies has already been attended by the best results. Among ourselves their worst enemies in modern times have been railway companies, inclosure acts, and rural police. In the presence of these unrelenting agents of what a French author has called "our liberticide

civilization," the tents of the Romany people vanish, and the tongue of the Romany people becomes a half-remembered jargon. But these irrepressible strangers die out in one direction only to emerge with renewed vitality in another. Gypsy encampments have lately been seen for the first time during many generations in Ireland, and gypsy bands may now be found roaming through all the vast spaces of the Western States of America from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande. Thus they seem about to regain in the New World the ground which the pressure of increasing population has cut from under their feet in the Old, and will, no doubt, find in the Far West, during many centuries to come, that middle district between barbarism and culture which forms their appropriate element.—P. 75.

FRAZER'S MAGAZINE. London, August, 1878.

This number of Frazer's contains a characteristic article by our former contributor, Edward W. Blyden, entitled "Africa and the Africans: By a Negro." The Magazine holds a high place in modern English literature; the August is a number of marked excellence; but for piquant thought, ready scholarship, and graceful English style, this writer is quite the peer of his co-contributors in the number.

Mr. Blyden's article attempts to vindicate the African character before a Caucasian audience. He complains of the cruel unanimity of Caucasians in maligning the negro character, assigns what he considers the valid cause for African inferiority, and maintains that the African nature has ample capacity, with fair play from other races, for a noble and beneficent future. The malign ridicule, above specified, comes alike from liberalistic and evangelistic sources, now from the Westminster Review, and anon from our Methodist Quarterly. Our able contribntor, Dr. Wentworth, who not long since furnished to our pages an article on Africa, meets the following rebuff:

DR. WENTWORTH AND THE AFRICAN.

In speaking of the love of music for which Africans are everywhere noted, Sir Samuel Baker says, with a touch of exaggeration:

The natives are passionately fond of music. I believe the safest way to travel in these wild countries would be to play the cornet without ceasing, which could insure a safe passage. A London organ-grinder would march through Central Africa followed by an admiring and enthusiastic crowd, who, if his tunes were lively, would form a dancing escort of most untiring materials....A man who, in full Highland dress, could at any time collect an audience by playing a lively air with the bagpipe, would be regarded with great veneration by the natives, and would be listened to when an archbishop by his side would be totally disregarded.

After quoting this passage, a grave American divine, in an elaborate article on Africa in an American Review, could see nothing from which to infer any noble qualities in the negro, and could not let the opportunity pass without indulging in the conventional giggle. Continuing Baker's joke, he still further degrades the impression, in order, apparently, to develop the smile into a "broad grin." He says: "An African's religion finds vent at his heels. Songs and dances form no inconsiderable part of the worship at a Southern colored camp-meeting. If we were constructing a ritual for the race we should certainly include this Shaker element."

"An African's religion" is inferred from what takes place at "a Southern colored camp-meeting." "A ritual for the whole race" must "include the Shaker element." We would assure the reverend doctor that such a "ritual" would be an egregious failure. The "Shaker element" prevails chiefly, if not entirely, among negroes, or "colored" people, who have been trained under the influence of the denomination of which Dr. Wentworth himself is a distinguished ornament. But only a comparatively small number of Africans are shouting Methodists. The greater portion of the race who are not pagans are either Mohammedans or Roman Catholics, and *their* "religion" does not "find vent at their heels."—Page 190.

Mr. Blyden's main base of defense of the African character is *the slave-trade.* Races in advance of the Africans have demoralized and ruined almost the entire tribes of the continent, and but for natural preventives would have depopulated it. As it is, they have rendered all life insecure, all permanent residence, culture, and civilization impracticable, and have spread depravation by wars, in which bribery has armed one chief and tribe against another, the kidnapping of the people being the object.

### CHARACTER AND EFFECTS OF THE SLAVE-TRADE.

We have no detailed account of the proceedings of the slave-hunters who captured the unfortunate creatures represented on Egyptian monuments; but we have pretty full accounts of the origin and character of the modern slave-trade, and we give here a summary from an able and well-informed source:

Within two centuries after the suppression of slavery in Europe, the Portuguese, in imitation of those piracies which existed in the uncivilized ages of the world, made their descents on Africa, and, committing depredations on the coast, first carried the wretched inhabitants into slavery. This practice, thus inconsiderable at its commencement, became general, and our ancestors, together with Spaniards, French, and most of the maritime powers of Europe, soon followed the piratical example; and thus did the Europeans revive a custom which their own ancestors had so lately exploded from a consciousness of its impiety. The unfortunate Africans fled from the coast, and sought, in the interior parts of the

country, a retreat from the persecution of their invaders; but the Europeans still pursued them, entered their rivers, sailed up into the heart of the country, surprised the Africans in their recesses, and carried them into slavery. The next step which the Europeans found it necessary to take was that of settling in the country, of securing themselves by fortified posts, of changing their system of force into that of pretended liberality, and by opening by every species of bribery and corruption a communication with the natives. Accordingly they erected their forts and factories, landed their merchandise, and endeavored by a peaceful deportment, by presents, and by every appearance of munificence, to allure the attachment and confidence of the Africans. Treaties of peace and commerce were concluded with the chiefs of the country, in which it was agreed that the kings on their part should from this period sentence prisoners of war and convicts to European servitude, and that the Europeans should supply them in return with the luxuries of Europe.*

Thus began that horrible traffic which for generations has distracted the African continent. The discovery of America stimulated the traffic and intensified its horrors.

Africans were deported to slaughter virgin forests, to test the capability of virgin soils, and to enrich both hemispheres with sugar, tobacco, cotton, and wines. And it is due to the terrors of its harborless coast, the malaria of its mangrove swamps, its burning deserts, its dangerous beasts and reptiles, its impenetrable jungles, its wary tribes prepared either for fight or flight, that Africa was not entirely depopulated to satisfy the greed of Christian nations for slaves during the last four centuries.

Though under the pressure of enlightened Christian sentiment the traffic has been abandoned by Christian nations, still the continent is made to bleed at almost every pore. Notwithstanding all that has been written and said on this subject, those who have seen any thing of the horrors of the traffic, which no pen can adequately describe, are solemnly impressed with the necessity of urging continually upon the public mind, with every possible emphasis and reiteration, the importance of its suppression. Livingstone says: "When endeavoring to give some account of the slave-trade of East Africa it was necessary to keep far within the truth, in order not to be thought guilty of exaggeration, (a thing Livingstone always abhorred;) but in sober seriousness the subject does not admit of exaggeration. To overdraw its evils is a simple impossibility. The sights I have seen, though common incidents of the traffic, are so nauseous that I always strive to drive them from my memory. In the case of most disagreeable recollections I can succeed, in time, in consigning them to oblivion; but the slaving scenes come back unbidden, and make me start up at dead of night, horrified by their vividness."

Sir Samuel Baker, in his "Albert Nyanza," describes an attack made upon a village for slaves, as follows: "Marching through the night, guided by their negro hosts, they bivouac within an hour's march of the unsuspecting village, doomed to an attack about half an hour before the break of day. Quietly surrounding the sleeping villages, they fire the grass huts in all directions, and pour volleys of musketry through the flaming thatch. Panic-

* Rees's New Cyclopedia, art. "Slavery."

stricken, the unfortunate victims rush from the burning dwellings, the men are shot down like pheasants in a *battue*, while the women and children are kidnapped and secured, the herds of cattle are driven away, and the human victims lashed together, forming a living chain, while a general plunder of the premises ensues."

In his "Ismailia" he says: "It is impossible to know the actual number of slaves taken from Central Africa annually. . . . The loss of life attendant upon the capture and subsequent treatment of the slaves is frightful. The results of this forced emigration, combined with the insecurity of life and property, is the withdrawal of the population from the infested districts. The natives have the option of submission to every insult, to the violation of their women and the pillage of their crops, or they must either desert their homes and seek independence in distant districts, or they must ally themselves with their oppressors to assist in the oppression of other tribes. Thus the seeds of anarchy are sown throughout Africa. The result is horrible confusion, distrust on all sides, treachery, devastation, and ruin.

"Graves and numerous skeletons (says Cameron) testified to the numbers whose lives had been sacrificed on this trying march, while slave clogs and forks still attached to some bleached bones, or lying by their side, gave only too convincing a proof that the demon of the slave-trade still exerted his influence in this part of Africa."

Schweinfurth, the German traveler, who traveled for some time in charge of the Nile slavers, and witnessed their diabolical proceedings, says that the "traders of Darfoor and Kordofan are as coarse, unprincipled, and villainous a set as imagination can conceive."—Pp. 182–184.

Defenders of our American slavery have usually maintained that our patriarchal institution has raised at least the imported slaves to a higher civilization. Mr. Blyden opines that it is the source of all the African degradation at home, and that the great body of immigrants coming from America thus far bring a degradation from their servile habits acquired in slavery very much unfitting them to be leaders in African civilization. It may be better when negro freemen, with manly character and culture acquired from freedom, voluntarily emigrate from America to Africa.

### ELOQUENT STATEMENT OF THE SITUATION.

Africa has been spoiled by all the races alien to her, and, under their stimulating example, by her own sons. Other races have passed through the baptism of slavery, as a stepping-stone to civilization and independence, but none has toiled under the crushing weight of a servitude so protracted, and inflicted from so many sources. Millenniums mark the period of the bondage

and humiliation of Africa's children. The four quarters of the globe have heard their groans and been sprinkled and stained with their blood. All that passed by have felt at liberty to contemn and plunder. The oppressors of this race have been men with religion, and men without religion—Christians, Mohammedans, and Pagans. Nations with the Bible, and nations with the Koran, and nations without Bible or Koran—all have joined in afflicting this continent. And now the last of her oppressors, tearing from her bosom annually half a million of her children, are nations with the Koran. All travelers tell us that when the Arab traders in East Africa are suppressed the work will be done. This will no doubt be accomplished before very long. The Viceroy of Egypt is pledged to England to suppress the traffic, and in a given time to abolish slavery altogether.

It was a long time before the Christian world discovered, or rather admitted, the wrong in the slave-trade; and we are persuaded that just as the truth in Christianity produced, though tardily, a Wilberforce and a Clarkson, so the truth in Islam will raise up, is now raising up, Muslim philanthropists and reformers who will give to the negro the hand of a brother, and perhaps, outstripping their Christian brethren in liberality, accord him an equal share in political and social privileges—a liberality in dealing with weaker races which some Europeans confess themselves unable to exercise.—Pp. 195, 196.

## *German Reviews.*

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by Dr. BRIEGER. Vol. I, No. 3. *Essays:* 1. SCHÜRER, Julius Africanus as Source of the pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Græcos.* 2. M. GASS, Vincentius of Beauvais and the *Speculum Morale.* 3. A. RITSCHL, The Origin of the Lutheran Church. 4. A. RITSCHL, George Witzel's Secession from Lutheranism. *Critical Reviews:* MÖLLER, The Literature of 1875, 1876, and 1877 on the History of Christian Doctrines. *Miscellaneous:* 1. ZAHN, Macarius of Magnesia. 2. KOLDE, Movements among the German Augustinians, and Luther's Journey to Rome. 3. KOLDE, Luther and the General of the Augustinian Order at Rome in 1518 and 1520.

Vol. II, No. 4. *Essays:* 1. DECHEND, Character and History of the Old Christian Sibyls. 2. GASS, Vincentius of Beauvais and the *Speculum Morale.* *Critical Reviews:* SEPP, History of Protestantism in the Netherlands. The Literature of the Years from 1875 to 1877. *Miscellaneous:* 1. A. HARNACK, Chronology of the Writings of Tertullian. 2. JACOBI, Rationalism in the Earlier Part of the Middle Ages. 3. MÜLLER, A Report on the Financial Transactions of the Roman Court in Germany, and the General Condition of the German Church. 4. WALTZ, Critique of the Luther Legend.

Dr. Dechend, evangelical pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, gives, in his article on the Character and History of the Sibylline Oracles of the old Christian Church, the results of special and long-continued studies. The Sibylline Oracles of the old

Christian Church, which in modern times have been edited by Friedlieb (1859) and by Alexandre, (1869, 2d edition,) must be well distinguished from the old pagan works of the same name, which, with the exception of a few fragments, are no longer extant, and from the Sibylline Oracles of the Middle Ages, which are much less important. Those of the old Christian Church were collected in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries after Christ, and contain partly Jewish, partly Christian prophecies. The oldest of them (Book III) belongs to the second century before Christ, while the youngest portions of the collection did not originate until the fourth century after Christ. The preface of the collector is still extant, but the time when he lived is uncertain. Certain, on the other hand, it is that the present comprehensive collection had been preceded by others of smaller compass. The author enters into a very full and elaborate investigation of every book of the collection, and takes occasion to acquaint us with the entire recent literature on the subject. As the final result of his investigations, he finds that nearly all the Sibylline Oracles of the Christian Church were controlled by heretical, or heterodox, or at least separatistic influences.

Dr. Th. Kolde, lecturer on theology at the University of Marburg, has for some time been engaged in the preparation of a work on John von Staupitz, the vicar-general of the congregation of Augustinian monks to which Luther belonged. He has, therefore, made extensive researches in the European libraries, and has found several manuscripts which in his opinion have not been made use of before. The interesting two little articles which he contributes to the above numbers of the "Journal for Church History" refer to the life of Dr. Martin Luther, and, as the author thinks, shed a new light upon some points of it. The former treats of the time from March, 1509, when Luther became *baccalaureus biblicus*, until October, 1512, when he was promoted to a doctor of theology. About this period in Luther's life we had hitherto less information than about any other period. It was only known that he had been for some time in Erfurt, and that shortly before his promotion he had made a journey to Rome in behalf of his order. That this journey was probably not made in 1510, as had formerly been assumed, but in 1511, had already been asserted by Dr.

Köstlin in his comprehensive and excellent biography of Luther, (1875,) and Dr. Kolde agrees with this assertion, but he then enters into a fuller discussion of the precise point of time and into the causes of the journey. Luther himself speaks only of his wish to make a general confession of his life, but his first biographer, Melanchthon, expressly refers to the controversies existing at that time between the German Augustinians as the principal cause of the journey. Dr. Kolde gives a very minute account of these controversies, with frequent reference to manuscripts as yet unpublished, and finds that Luther was sent in company with John of Malines to Rome by the vicar-general, Staupitz, in order to secure the carrying through of a change in the constitution of the German Augustinians, in behalf of which both Staupitz and his predecessor, Andreas Proles, had been very active.

The second article refers to some measures adopted by the vicar-general of the Augustinian eremites, Gabriel Venetus, for the purpose of silencing the voice of Luther. When the Augustinian general, Æquidius of Viterbo, a man not altogether unfriendly to the religious reformation, was made a cardinal, Pope Leo X. offered the position of vicar-general of the eremites (a branch of the order) to Gabriel Venetus, and when the latter at first declined the position, finally prevailed upon him to accept by pointing to the importance of the mission to appease "that man" Luther, Leo still being of opinion that at that time it would be easy to extinguish the recent flame, but that a further delay might have evil consequences. Dr. Kolde publishes from a Munich codex for the first time two letters of Gabriel Venetus, one to Gerard Hecker, the provincial of the Saxon province of German Augustinians, and the other to John Staupitz, which are very explicit in the expression of the opinion of the Roman vicar-general as to how Luther should be treated. Especially is this the case with the letter addressed to Hecker, who is ordered to "have the aforesaid brother Martin Luther seized and incarcerated, to keep him in custody with fettered hands and feet, and to send him thus to Rome." He is authorized to lay the interdict upon every town and to excommunicate every person that might oppose the carrying out of the above order, and to do every thing that might appear suitable to secure the incarceration,

and to do all this in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In case of a refusal, Hecker is threatened himself with the loss of all his degrees, honors, and offices. The letter to Hecker is dated August 25, 1518; that to Staupitz, March 15, 1520. Staupitz is believed to have resigned soon after receiving this letter; he was unwilling to co-operate in any harsh measures against Luther, though he was too undecided to join the Reformation. Hecker, on the other hand, became subsequently a zealous reformer.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews. Edited by Dr. RIEHM and Dr. KOSTLIN. Third Number. 1878.) *Essays:* 1. SCHMIDT, On the Limits of a Life of Jesus. 2. GOERGENS, The Old Testament Ophir. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. KAWERAU, Luther and his Relations to Servetus. 2. DIEGEL, Comparison of the Present Evangelical Preaching with that Prevailing Fifty Years Ago. 3. ROSCH, The Three Pillar Apostles in the Secret Language of the Talmud.

Fourth Number. 1878. *Essays:* 1. GOEBEL, The Parable Mark iv, 26–29. 2. SPITTA, On the Personal Notices in the Second Epistle to Timothy. 3. SCHÜRER, The Meeting Place of the Great Synedrium. 4. TRÜMPELMANN, Socialism and Social Reform. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. SCHMID, Robert Mayer, his Scientific Discoveries and his Religious Views. 2. KEPPE, The Pietist Gisbertus Voetius at Utrecht. 3. SEIDEMANN, Letters from Amsdorf, Eck, and Luther.

It is quite unusual to meet in a periodical so grave and stately as the *Studien und Kritiken* has always been an article on a subject of so general and popular an interest as the article on Socialism and Social Reform, by A. Trümpelmann, Superintendent at Helleben, near Gotha. The appearance of the article in such a paper is itself another indication that all sections of the German Protestant Churches are awakening to the importance which the social-democratic agitations have already attained for the future of the German Empire in general, and of German Protestantism in particular. In no country of the world do the Socialists at present constitute so strong and compact a political party as in Germany. At the general election of a German Reichstag in 1877 the Socialists elected twelve of their candidates, and, though they were fully organized in only two thirds of the electoral districts, they polled about 500,000 votes out of a total of 5,500,000. At the elections recently held, at which the utmost efforts were made by all the Governments of Germany to reduce the socialistic votes, they exhibited a new increase in nearly all the large cities, although they did not elect the same number of candidates. Such a numerical strength is well calculated to alarm the State Government

and all who regard the realization of the socialistic dream of a radical change of our present society as a return to chaos. It is especially alarming for the German Protestant Churches, for nearly all the leaders of the Socialists of Germany agree in proclaiming their party to be a party of atheists, and the immense majority of the adherents of this party has been recruited from Protestant, not from Roman Catholic, districts. The claims of the Socialists have made a profound stir in German literature, and the number of works on the socialistic question amounts to many thousands. It will, of course, be expected that these works present an almost infinite variety of views. Among the theological writers there are some who are ready to accept the socialistic view concerning the right of property and the reconstruction of society, and to confine their opposition to the religious radicalism of the system. A court preacher of Berlin, Stöcker, has made an attempt to establish a Christian Socialistic party, which sets forth its views in the *Staats Socialist*, and which presented at the recent election its own candidates in several electoral districts; but the author of this article in the *Studien und Kritiken* undertakes to show that the fundamental views of the Socialists as to a reorganization of society are indissolubly connected with their politico-religious radicalism, and are fully as dangerous to the existence of a civilized State. The author then enters into a thorough discussion of the organization of labor, and the relation existing between labor and capital, and announces a second article which will discuss other fundamental questions of Socialism.

The biographical notice of Robert Mayer by his friend, the Rev. Rudolf Schmid, Dean of Schwäbish Hall, derives its chief interest from the information which it gives on the religious views of the great German physicist. The name of Robert Mayer, the discoverer of the mechanical theory of heat, is familiar to every student of physical science. The life of Mayer, like that of so many other discoverers and reformers, was one of great toil and hardship. When he for the first time announced his views to the literary world he was so cruelly misrepresented, maligned, and ridiculed that his health received a terrible shock, from which he never fully recovered. Though he remained all life long a practical physician in a small German town, he succeeded in having his view recognized by the

whole scientific world, which now worships but few names in its entire history so highly as that of Robert Mayer. That this great scientist was in his religious belief a humble and devout believer in the personal God and the Christian revelation, and that he was fond of professing his belief on every public occasion, is especially noteworthy at a time when such great efforts are made to diffuse the impression that every further progress of physical science denotes a further decline of Christian belief.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) May, 1878.—1. SUCHARD, A New Explanation of the Origin of Being. 2. E. DE PRESSENSE, An Individualist in Politics. 3. MASSEBIEN, A Quaker Missionary at Paris at the Time of Mazarin. 4. LICHTENBERGER, German Chronicles.

June, 1878.—1. STAPFER, The Actual Mission of French Protestantism. 2. F. PUAUX, St. Bartholomew. 3. GABORD, Origin and Development of Rousseau's Religious Ideas. 4. PFENDER, Bible Translations.

July, 1878.—1. HOLLARD, The Church. 2. FEER, Freret and the *Salon* of Baron Holbach. 3. NIEGAARD, The Roman Church and Religious Freedom.

August, 1878.—1. BOEGNER, Individualism in Public Worship. 2. BIANQUIS, The Poetry of Southern Europe. 3. ROEHRICH, A Sister of Jeanne d'Arc.

In the July number of the Methodist Quarterly Review we referred (p. 545) to a new movement in favor of Protestantism which is now taking place in France, and awakening in many quarters enthusiastic hopes. As will be seen from the above table of contents of the *Revue Chretienne*, the first article of the June number of this periodical is specially devoted to a full discussion of the subject. At the head of his article the author, E. Stapfer, enumerates the recent literature on the subject, which is quite extensive, and embraces, besides works from Bouchard, Renouvier, and Reveillard, who have already been referred to in our former reference to this subject, treatises from Laveleye, G. d'Alveilla, Albrespy, Paul Janet, and Mac All.

Paul Janet is one of the most distinguished French teachers of philosophy, and a prominent representative of that philosophical school which opposes the materialistic tendencies of our age, and, therefore, calls itself *spiritualiste*, to which word, as will be seen from this definition, a meaning is given quite different from the one most common in the United States. Janet published, on December 26, 1877, in a daily paper of

Paris, *Le Temps*, an article on "*Le Mouvement Philosophique*," in which he reviewed a number of recent works, among others one by a Protestant author, Albrespy, entitled, "How Nations Become Free," ("*Comment les Peuples Deviennent Libres.*") Albrespy undertakes to prove, by numerous examples and a great display of quotations, that a nation can establish its political and social liberties in a lasting manner only by embracing Protestantism. Janet is not of this opinion, and remarks: "What does this author want? Shall France become Protestant? Is this reasonable? Is it possible? Has not the opportunity passed three hundred years ago? Is there a man sufficiently credulous to believe that the fatherland of Bossuet and Voltaire can now become a disciple of Luther and Calvin? One may lament the turn affairs have taken in the past; I do not object, but what can be done? The question has now been solved." All the Protestant papers of France have replied to this article, and, more or less, they all indulge the hope that French Protestantism is on the eve of a new and more prosperous era. M. Stapfer admits that some years ago he himself entertained but a feeble hope for any considerable progress of Protestantism in France, and that it seemed more probable to him that the next religious reformation in France could only be one like that attempted by Father Hyacinthe. Since then, however, the prospects for an advance of Protestantism have become much more favorable. The efforts of Father Hyacinthe have not led to any practical results, and only three or four representatives of the Old Catholic movement now remain in France. The odious attacks which were made upon French Protestants as the co-religionists of the hated Prussians have ceased. The Republican Government, which maintains itself in France in spite of the most violent opposition of the Roman Church, is likely to give to Protestantism a greater freedom, and to smooth the way for its further progress by the introduction of universal and compulsory education. The obstacles which Protestants will have to overcome before they can obtain large accessions are, however, very great. "Protestantism," says the author of our article, "is little known in France, and for a long time Protestants have been looked upon as foreigners. They had preserved from the time of persecution the habit of keeping themselves in retirement, and the wish not

to be talked about. Now, as long as they will thus remain unknown and without influence, the people of France will have strong reason to remain Catholic by name. In the provinces, especially in the departments of the center, the inhabitants do really not know what a French Protestant is. We have met ourselves, in a provincial town, persons who believed that Protestants were always either English, or Germans, or Americans, but that there were no French Protestants. In such places it may, of course, be expected that none will separate from the Catholic ranks except those whom their conscience compels to leave; for the merchant who embraces Protestantism will at once lose at least one half of his customers; the magistrate loses his influence, the physician his patients. The physician may become a materialist; the clergy will cause him but little trouble; but he will not be allowed to become a heretic. Those who act thus know well that materialism and free thought will not become dangerous for them, but that Protestantism is dangerous." The author then develops at length his views as to the best measures for promoting the new movement in behalf of Protestantism.

## ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF ASIA.

ASIA was once the cradle of Christianity and the seat of most of the Apostolic Churches; but never during the entire history of Christianity has the majority of the Asiatics belonged to the Christian Church. The flourishing Churches of Western Asia were sadly desolated and finally wrecked by the Turks, and only a few fragments, the largest of which is the Armenian Church, have preserved an unbroken existence until the present time. The total Christian population of Asia is only about 17,000,000, in a total population of about 814,000,000. It is, however, a remarkable fact that the rule of the great Christian powers of Europe over Asiatic territory is now extending very rapidly, that already more than one half of the entire area of Asia is under Christian government, that the number of Christians is now growing very rapidly, and that the end of the late Eastern war, which has again so largely added to the power of each of the two great Christian world-empires, Russia and England, greatly brightens the prospects of Christianity. In the following lines we shall attempt to give some of the principal facts relating to the present condition of the Christian Churches of Asia.

Comparatively the strongest Christianity is in the Asiatic dominions of Russia, which embrace no less than 6,500,000 square miles, while the total area of Asia is estimated at about 17,800,000 square miles. This immense territory will never be densely populated; still, the population in some parts of it is increasing rapidly. Throughout Asiatic Russia the growth of the Russian Church keeps, naturally, pace with the advance of the Russian rule, and even outruns it as the Christianization of the native tribes makes more rapid progress than their absorption by the Russian nationality. The steady progress of Russia has already made Christianity the ruling and the most populous religion throughout Northern Asia, and it may be expected that this proportion will rapidly extend into Central Asia. The total population of Asiatic Russia amounts to about 13,500,000. The Russian Church claims a population of about 5,800,000; for the sects which have separated from the Russian Church about 160,000 are set down, and the Gregorian Armenian Church numbers a population of 600,000. The Eastern Churches in general, therefore, control a population of about 6,060,000. The Church of Rome, including the United Armenian Church, numbers a population of about 51,000, and various Protestant Churches an aggregate of about 14,000. It may be said, therefore, that about one half of the population of Asiatic Russia is Christian.

Asiatic Turkey embraces most of the remnants of the ancient Christian Churches. The large majority of these belong to the Greek and Armenian communions. Besides these, there are Nestorians and Jacobites. Trustworthy statistical reports on the present condition of all these Churches are wanting. Small numbers of each of these four Eastern Churches have, in the course of time, connected themselves with the Church of Rome, retaining, however, their ancient rites and some other peculiarities. They are commonly known as the United Greeks, United Armenians, United Chaldeans, (Nestorians,) and United Syrians, (Jacobites.) At the head of each is a Patriarch. Besides them, the entire tribe of the Maronites, numbering about 140,000 persons, is united with the Church of Rome. E. J. Ravenstein, in a treatise on the population of Russia and Turkey in the "Journal of the Statistical Society," (Sept., 1877,) assumes the total population of Asiatic Turkey to be about 16,800,000, and estimates the Christian population at 2,800,000. The Christians he divides into Greeks, 1,480,000; Armenians, 740,000; Roman Catholics, 100,000; Protestants, 10,000; Maronites, etc., 487,000. This is not a good classification, as the Maronites are Roman Catholics. Generally the entire population connected with the Eastern Churches is estimated about 3,000,000; that connected with the Church of Rome, including the Maronites and those fragments of the Eastern communions which have acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, at about 260,000. They are about divided as follows: United Greeks, (Melchites,) 25,000; United Armenians, 75,000; United Chaldeans and United Syrians, 20,000; Maronites, 140,000. A portion of the United Arminians and the United Chaldeans stand at present, however, in opposition to the Pope.

The Asiatic territory under British rule amounts to about 1,600,000 square miles, which is about one quarter of the Russian territory, and one eleventh of the whole area of Asia. The population ruled by Great Britain, if we include the tributary States of India, exceeds 242,000,000, more than eighteen times as much as the Asiatic population of Russia, and more than one quarter of the entire population of Asia. Enumerations to ascertain the religious creeds of the inhabitants of India were taken in the various provinces and tributary States during the years 1868 to 1876. A verification of all these returns, with the results of the general census of India, furnished the following classification of the leading creeds in the provinces under British administration:—

| *Creeds.* | *Numbers.* | *Creeds.* | *Numbers.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hindus | 139,948,568 | Christians | 897,216 |
| Mohammedans | 40,882,537 | Other creeds | 5,102,823 |
| Buddhists | 2,832,851 | Religion not known | 1,977,400 |
| Sikhs | 1,174,486 | | |
| | | Total | 191,065,445 |

These figures refer to the provinces of India which are under direct British administration, and do not include the tributary States, which have an aggregate population of 50,325,457 persons. Some of these native States largely add to the Christian population of India. This is especially the case with Travancore and Cochin, both situated in the presidency of Madras. Travancore alone had, according to an official census taken in 1875, 470,000 Christians in a total population of 2,311,379, and Cochin, which has a total population of 601,114, is likewise largely Christian. Since the taking of the census very large accessions to the Protestant Churches have taken place in several provinces, and this movement is still going on. The present Christian population of British India, inclusive of the native States, cannot fall much short of 1,700,000, divided about as follows: Roman Church, 1,100,000; Protestant Churches, 300,000; Christians of St. Thomas and Jacobites, 300,000. Next to British India, the island of Ceylon is the most important British possession in Asia. It had in 1875 a population of 2,459,542 persons, among whom about 113,000 were Roman Catholics, and 42,000 Protestants. The other British possessions in Asia add no more than a few thousands to the number of either Catholics or Protestants. We estimate, therefore, the Christian population of British Asia about as follows: Roman Catholics, 1,320,000; Protestants, 350,000; Eastern Churches, 300,000. Total, 1,970,000.

Besides the Russians and English, also the French, Netherlanders, Spaniards, and Portuguese own large territories in Asia. Their aggregate amounts to about 1,000,000 square miles. The population of these territories was estimated in 1878, as follows:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Spanish possessions | | | 6,000,000 |
| French | " | including the tributary State of Cambodja | 2,761,000 |
| Portuguese | " | | 766,000 |
| Dutch | " | | 24,838,000 |
| Total | | | 34,365,000 |

The population in the Spanish possessions, which embrace the Philippine Islands, is nominally connected with the Church of Rome, so far as Spanish rule extends. France has a Catholic population in Cochin China of 43,000, in Cambodja of 10,000, and in its East India possessions of about 250,000. Portugal owns in Asia Goa, Macao, and a part of the island of Timor. In Goa and Macao Catholicism has been the ruling Church for about three centuries, while Timor has no Catholic Churches, and only pays tribute to Portugal. We estimate the nominally Catholic population in the Spanish possessions at 4,000,000; in the French possessions at 800,000, in the Portuguese possessions at 350,000. The Protestant population in all these territories is insignificant.

The Government of the Netherlands has long shown to all Christian missionaries a spirit not only of indifference, but of disgraceful hostility. It has designedly impeded instead of promoting the work of missions. This period has now passed away; the Christian missionaries are protected in the preaching of the Gospel, and laudable efforts are made for the establishment of schools and the diffusion of education. Protestantism has gained a firm footing on Java and Celebes, and begins to extend on the other islands. The total population connected with the Protestant Churches in the Dutch colonies is estimated at about 170,000, while the Church of Rome, which has a Vicar Apostolic in Batavia, claims a population of about 80,000.

It is one of the brightest pages in the missionary history of the Church of Rome that out of long and bloody persecutions she has been able to save in China a population of nearly 500,000. The Catholic population in China proper was estimated in 1878 at about 450,000, for whom there were 328 European and 203 native priests in 22 Vicarates Apostolic, (dioceses.) Of the Chinese dependencies Corea had about 20,000, Mongolia 5,000, Mantchooria 9,000, and Tibet 10,000 Catholics. In Japan, where the last vestiges of the Churches established in the sixteenth century were believed to have been rooted out, many descendants of former Catholics have been found to have secretly adhered to their Church, and they have recently begun to rally again openly around the altar of Rome. The missionaries claim 20,000 as being again in full communion with their Church, and they estimate the number of those in whom religious meetings and the practice of religious rites have maintained some kind of traditional connection with the missions of the sixteenth century, at more than 100,000. The comparatively largest number of converts the Church of Rome counts in the empire of Anam, where she had in 1878 a population of 483,000, or about 2.2 per cent. of the whole population. The kingdom of Burmah has about 5,000, that of Siam 25,000, and Persia 10,000 Catholics.

Protestant missions outside of the territories controlled by Christian governments are of comparatively recent origin. Hardly any of them antedate the nineteenth century. Now, however, numerous societies are vying with each other in occupying the immense field. In several places important triumphs have been obtained, and the prospect throughout is

encouraging. The population connected with the mission in China is about 25,000, in Japan 4,000, and Persia 3,000.

If we now try to tabulate the statistical information contained in the foregoing remarks, the present condition of the Christian Churches of Asia will be shown by the following table:—

| | Eastern Church. | Roman Catholic Church. | Protestant Church. | Total Christians. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia | 5,941,000 | 51,000 | 14,000 | 6,006,000 |
| Turkey | 3,000,000 | 260,000 | 10,000 | 3,270,000 |
| Persia | 50,000 | 10,000 | 3,000 | 63,000 |
| China | 5,000 | 500,000 | 25,000 | 53,0000 |
| Japan | 2,000 | 20,000 | 4,000 | 26,000 |
| Anam | .... | 483,000 | .... | 483,000 |
| Burmah (proper) | .... | 5,000 | .... | 5,000 |
| Siam | .... | 25,000 | .... | 25,000 |
| British possessions | 300,000 | 1,320,000 | 350,000 | 1,970,000 |
| French | .... | 300,000 | .... | 300,000 |
| Spanish | .... | 4,000,000 | .... | 4,000,000 |
| Portuguese | .... | 350,000 | .... | 350,000 |
| Dutch | .... | 80,000 | 170,000 | 250,000 |
| Total | 9,298,000 | 7,404,000 | 576,000 | 17,278,000 |

## Art. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*The Doctrine of the Apocalypse, and its Relations to the Doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John.* By Pastor Hermann Gebhardt. Translated from the German by Rev. John Jefferson. 8vo., pp. 424. Edinburgh: H. J. Clark. 1878.

In 1826 De Wette uttered the oracular announcement that the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse could not have been written by the same author. Assuming this dictum as axiomatic, the "higher criticism" of Germany divided into two parties, one maintaining the apostolic authorship of the Gospel, and the other of the Apocalypse. And at a much later date Professor Keim announces that John is "historically vanquished." This is very much in the style of Voltaire's "Crush the Wretch." But the crushed Christ still lives, and the vanquished evangelist still conquers, and both will live and conquer when these critical antichrists are dead and rotten.

The fourth Gospel was written by John. The three Epistles were written by John. The Apocalypse was written by that same John. St. John did reside and die in Asia Minor. He was banished to the isle of Patmos. He wrote his Apocalypse not in the reign of Nero, nor of Galba, nor of Vespasian, but of Domitian.

All these statements were historically asserted with wonderful unanimity by the earliest Christian antiquity, and they are well substantiated truths. The reverse statements are made by modern German criticism, and they are unequivocal lies.

Pastor Gebhardt's book is a clear showing of the marked and minute coincidences between the theology of the Apocalypse and John's other books. The resemblance is very complete, and is often of that occult character that discloses unintentionality and unconsciousness. In this peculiarity his arguments bear a striking resemblance to Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ." The same doctrines are often expressed, in both Gospel and Apocalypse, with a similarity of phrase, and often with a singular coincidence of thought in varied phrase. And thus this internal argument is twofold, based both on doctrine and on style. And that is carrying the war into Africa, for it is on differences of style between Apocalypse and Gospel that the former is denied to John. Even Alford acknowledges that the differences of style is a great difficulty not wholly removed. That difficulty is removable, we think, by two considerations. *First*, There are ample instances in literature of styles quite as diverse by the same author. In his young days Thomas Carlyle wrote, if we rightly recollect so far back, a life of Schiller and a life of Stirling, both in a chaste English, in perfect contrast to the grotesqueries of his "latter day pamphlets" and other spasmodic effusions. And these two cases are parallel, from the fact that it was in old age that both writers unfolded their "wild oats." Thomas Moore, in his "Life of Sheridan," gives opinion that Burke's style grew gorgeous with advancing age. The contrast between his early treatise on the "Sublime and Beautiful" and his thunderings against the French Revolution would seem to require two very different minds. *Second*, There are underlying identities of style which demonstrate identity of authorship. The subjects, of course, are stupendously different, and so require even of the same writer a stupendous difference of style. In the Apocalypse the pictorial imagination is perpetually on its utmost stretch; events and objects are crowding upon each other with intense rapidity. The scenery and pictorial material is generally borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures, with immense improvements. And, more than all, the mind of the writer, steeped in Hebraism, is in a preternatural state. He who was in his youth a son of thunder has all the thunder of his youth supernaturally renewed within him. Rightly, the extraordinary conditions demand an extraordinary change of style, both of thought and language. And yet, underlying all this change, the natural style and mind unmistakedly

disclose themselves. He who cannot see this was never born a critic, and can never be reconstructed into one.

Pastor Gebhardt's treatise is an admirable contribution to the demonstration of this identity. His process was, first, to exclude the Gospel of John from his thought, and to study the Apocalypse from a most intense individualistic stand-point; then to study them both in connection and unfold the results. Of these two parts of the process his book consists. The first part, thereby, is a very searching analysis of the book; a sharp-eyed commentary on the Apocalypse. The second is a very powerful showing of a striking mental identity reigning through both books. For students who love to indulge in "apocalyptic hours" the first part will be very welcome; to those who feel the identity of authorship a perplexing question (as we do not) the second will bring a powerful solution.

Pastor Gebhardt is very wrong on three points. He is *semi-rationalistic;* he is *predestinarian;* and he is *pre-millennial.* On several minor points is he semi-rationalistic, but a very major point is his identifying "the beast" of chapter xiii with Nero, and so making St. John a false prophet. Of that beast it is said he was, and is not, and yet is. Now, it so happens that when Nero was assassinated, there was a current belief among his rabble of friends, that he really escaped from the assassin alive, and would yet return and recover his throne. This belief is held by our pastor as basis for John's making the beast to be slain, descend to the bottomless pit, and ascend therefrom. This Nero beast, as he interprets, is the sixth of the first eight Roman emperors; the seventh is his successor, Galba. And when we ask who was "the eighth" predicted by John as yet to come, we are answered, *Nero risen from the dead!* What a monster of an exegesis! And yet the pastor holds that the Apocalypse was written by the Apostle John! And this Apostle John prophesied that Nero, risen from the dead, would be the eighth emperor of Rome, when, in fact, the eighth was Otho. But this is not the worst of the matter. John makes, as Gebhardt interprets, the second advent, as described in Rev. xix, (which we do not believe to be a description of the second advent,) take place during the life of this beast, Nero. In fact, the Son of man descends from heaven at his advent for the very purpose of catching Nero alive and casting him into the lake of fire even before the general judgment of chapter xx. All that reduces the Apocalypse to an imposture fit only to be flung into the waste basket. This accords with the run of German interpreters, (including Düsterdieck,) and essentially followed by Stuart.

The pastor is a forlorn predestinarian. In the retrospective view closing in John's Gospel the history of Jewish unbelief, (chap. xiii, 37–40,) the evangelist, quoting Isaiah's statement that God had blinded their eyes, adds, "therefore they could not believe." Thereupon thus expoundeth Pastor Gebhardt: "There can be no doubt that in the thought of the evangelist, as in that of the seer, there existed, side by side with each other, the human historical view, according to which God wills the salvation of all men, and offers it to them, but they, freely deciding, believe or become hardened; and the divine absolute view, according to which some men believe and attain salvation, because God wills it, and others do not believe and are lost, because God hardens them, and has not appointed them to salvation." The "human historical view," that man is free and responsible, is thus contradicted, abolished, and annihilated by a certain "divine absolute view," which affirms that God has beforehand excluded them from all adequate power to believe. Now the pastor forgets that both the prophet and the evangelist make that deprivation of power a consequent of antecedent unbelief *with* power to believe. It is that self-superinduced incapacity for faith which we well know as often taking place in human obduracy; which is at once responsible because freely self-superinduced, and yet judicial and divinely imposed both by naturally established sequences and a justly withdrawn divine influence. Pastor Gebhardt revives the weary contradiction that is the stigma of all Calvinistic theology, which so misstates the cause of God as puts him in the wrong and places right and justice on the side of the sinner. It recalls that vain jangle so well expressed by the popular antinomies:—

> "You can and you can't, you shall and you shan't,
> You will and you wont,
> You'll be damned if you do, and you'll be damned if you don't."

Pastor Gebhardt, thirdly and lastly, is a *pre-millennialist*. Like most of his co-thinkers, he bases his view upon making "souls" mean bodies in Rev. xx, 4. He admits the souls under the altar of chapter iv to be "souls," but those same "souls" on the throne in chapter xx are, forsooth, live bodies. Like the rest of the millennarians he believes that this view is clinched by verse 5, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." On that verse we remark: 1. The verse is of doubtful authenticity, being not found in the best authorities. 2. The word "again" is certainly spurious. 3. The Greek word for "until" does not imply that they will "live" after the close of the thou-

sand years. All that we get from the verse, then, is the declaration that, so far as that period is concerned, "the rest" did not live the imparadised life of these souls. What kind of a *life* that is is indicated by the terms "river of life," "tree of life;" namely, a celestial life overlying mere conscious vitality.

---

*The Theological Trilemma;* or, The Threefold Question of Endless Misery, Universal Salvation, or Conditional Immortality. By Rev. J. H. PETTINGELL, M.A.

This book is very respectably written, in a good style and spirit, with clearness and candor. The author professes to be strictly evangelical, and he does hold and teach most of the commonly received evangelical doctrines. He rejects the doctrines that all men are to be converted, either in this world or the next, and finally saved; also, that the wicked are to be punished forever. The soul is not naturally immortal. Immortality is the gift of God, and it is given to those only of our fallen race who repent of their sins and are regenerated. Those who die in their sins are literally destroyed. They go out of existence. The devil and his angels are also destroyed; and with the end of these there is, so far as we know, the end of sin and misery in the universe. Naught remains but God, and the holy angels and his loyal and ransomed ones, to enjoy and praise him in heavenly places forever.

Mr. Pettingell urges a variety of considerations in proof of what we call, though he does not, the annihilation of the wicked. He alleges, first of all, that *death* literally signifies annihilation; that so our first parents must have understood the original threatening; and that whenever the word death is used in Scripture to set forth the final doom of the wicked, it can mean nothing else. But is it true that death literally and properly signifies annihilation? Annihilation of what? Not the body, for the dead body still remains. It may be seen and handled as before. The truth is that death, in its primary and literal signification, annihilates no material thing. It changes the form of living substances; in its issues it dissolves them, and turns them back to their original ingredients; but death, we repeat, annihilates nothing. And if death does not annihilate material substances, much less can it put an end to human souls. It certainly does not end the souls of the righteous; and in Scripture we often hear of the souls of the wicked as living and suffering after death. The rich man in the Gospel died and was buried, and "in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Luke xvi, 23. And of that

wicked generation to whom Noah preached we hear, thousands of years after their destruction in the deluge, they were still alive—"spirits in prison"—where they remain, undoubtedly, to the present time. 1 Peter iii, 19.

But we are told that as eternal life imports an immortal existence, eternal death, which is its opposite, must import annihilation. But eternal life does not import simply an eternal existence, but an eternally *blessed* existence. "This," says our Saviour, "is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." John xvii, 3. Eternal life, then, is not a mere eternal existence, but an eternally happy existence with God and Christ in heaven. What, then, must its opposite, eternal death, be, but a state of eternal sinning and suffering in hell?

But there are other words besides death on which great stress is laid in this argument for annihilation. The wicked are said in the Scriptures to be consumed, destroyed, burned up, lost, a phraseology which imports that they pass utterly out of existence. "The Lord preserveth all them that love him: but all the wicked will he destroy." Psa. cxlv, 20. "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. x, 28. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i, 9. We may take the two strongest passages, probably, which the Bible contains, and see if they necessarily import annihilation: "Behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, . . . that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Suppose a thing to be burned up, so as to leave neither root nor branch; is it thereby annihilated? By no means. To burn up and consume is only to change the form of things, not to annihilate them. Not a particle is lost. Water may be evaporated; wood and gas may be burned; but the substance of both still exists. And so through the entire range of material substances known to man. Through every form of disorganization the particles composing the substance will remain, and, for aught we know, may remain forever.

We are referred to certain passages in the Old Testament which are thought to teach annihilation: such as Psa. vi, 5; Eccl. ix, 10; Psa. cxlvi, 3, 4; and Jer. li, 57.

These passages, if they prove any thing, prove too much for the

class of men with whom we now reason. They prove that the cessation of active, conscious existence takes place in death, and pervades the entire region of the grave. For instance: "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." But the probability is that these and the like passages have a merely relative meaning. Some of them refer to the state of the lifeless body which lies unconscious in the grave. Others go to show that not even the spirits of the dead have any longer an active interest and concern, such as they once had, in the affairs of this life. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." As much as to say that, in the moment of death, the designs, the plans, of man for this world are all cut off. The rich fool in the Gospel was planning to pull down his barns and build greater, and to enjoy life for many years. But death came unexpectedly, and "in that very day his thoughts perished."

The arguments from nature as to the soul's immortality are all of them confirmed by the clearer light of revelation. In the Old Testament we have enough to convince us that, while the body and the brute are mortal, the human spirit is immortal. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." Eccles. iii, 21. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Eccles. xii, 7. "Them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii, 2. But it is in the Gospel, emphatically, that "life and immortality are brought to light;" immortality, not for a particular class of men, but for all. Whether righteous or wicked, all have entered upon an existence which is never to end. Now, it is objection enough to the theory of annihilation, that it contradicts, confessedly and palpably, this great doctrine of immortality. For those who die in their sins there is, we are told, no immortality. They are to be annihilated.

According to the doctrine which has been considered, annihilation is the penalty of God's law. This was the penalty threatened to our first parents, and the penalty which will ultimately be inflicted upon those who obey not the Gospel. "The wages of sin is death." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death"—understanding, in all these passages, annihilation.

Now, in opposition to all such statements, we insist that annihilation is not, and cannot be, the penalty of God's law. We know what this penalty is, for it has once been executed. It was executed upon the angels that sinned. For them there was no reprieve—no probation of grace. The penalty of the law fell upon them in the moment of their transgression, and has been upon them ever since. And what was it? They were not annihilated; but "cast down to hell," (2 Peter ii, 4,) where they are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Jude 6. This penalty will be inflicted on all the wicked at the close of the judgment. And what is it? "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. xxv, 41, 46.

We know it is said that annihilation is everlasting punishment because it is everlasting in its consequences. But as well might it be said that hanging or flogging was everlasting punishment, because these are everlasting in their consequences. Indeed, with more propriety may it be said of the ordinary modes of human punishment that they are everlasting; for they are followed by a train of consequences that will have no end: whereas, to the subject of it annihilation cuts off all consequences. A perpetual nonentity is beyond the reach of all consequences forever, and this shows that annihilation, so far from being the penalty of the law, is, in no proper sense of the term, a punishment; on the contrary, it cuts off all punishment. Punishment necessarily implies the existence of a subject to bear it. It is a just punishment, it implies the existence of a guilty subject. But on the theory before us, the subject of punishment is no longer in existence. He is a nonentity—nothing; and how is it possible to punish nothing?

And, lastly, what are we to think of the following passages from the Revelation? "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. xiv, 9–11. Again, the writer of this book, speaking of the great numbers who will go forth near

the end of this world for the destruction of God's people, says: "And fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them; and the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Rev. xx, 10. P.

*Outlines of Biblical Psychology.* By J. T. Beck, D.D., Prof. Ord. Theol., Tübingen. Translated from the Third Enlarged and Corrected German Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Special Edition imported by Scribner & Co. 1877. Price, $2.

This volume consists of extracts from lectures delivered in 1841 before both professional and lay hearers, and meeting high approval. If his lectures were as concise as his chapters, and abounded with as copious references to Scripture passages without quoting them in full, the professor must have been blessed with marvelously appreciative audiences. The work, from its extreme condensation, needs to be *studied* as well as *read* by American thinkers, and will amply repay the time and labor of a full mastery of its principles.

The professor finds or assumes, in accordance with Roos, Spener, and Delitzsch, that from Genesis to Apocalypse the Bible has a single and uniform system of psychology. He maintains that a misunderstanding or rejection of that psychology falsifies our theology and weakens our apologetics. His own theological system is framed in accordance with it, and he believes that its restoration would renew the power of Christian doctrine. We believe this to be so far true that the assertion, now too common, that Paul's recognition of *body, soul,* and *spirit,* in 1 Thess. v, 23, is merely a use of the then prevalent psychology, is at once superficial, false, and injurious. The threefold distinction is not confined to a single text, or a few texts, or to New Testament texts, but reigns in the whole Bible, as it does in truth and nature. The theologian loses by its rejection his clearest distinction between man and brute, and his best ground for the immortality of solely the former.

In successive chapters on "soul as breath," and "soul as blood," sustained by volumes of Scripture reference, Dr. Beck maintains that it is not the body that *breathes,* but the *soul;* the soul quickened by the spirit. Hence, when soul has departed, the outward air poured in upon the lungs does not revive the body. The soul acts, performing the true movement in inhalation; nay, the soul is a spontaneous breath, inhaling and inhaled. Breath and chyle, brought together in the blood, circulate and animate the whole

system. Yet the *soul* must itself be vivified by the *spirit*, as the body is vivified by the *soul*.

The *heart* in Scripture is not, as in modern phrase, a synonym for the affections or emotions. It is the residence of the operating soul, the workshop of all its operations. "*The heart is the first thing to live.* It exists and acts sooner than the organism, and even furnishes materials for the formation of it. So, too, it *survives the organism*, being the last organ that fulfills its office. Haller calls it '*primum vivens, ultimum moriens.*' This points to the meaning which Scripture gives to the heart—namely, center of life. Its first motion is the sure sign of life, its stillness the sure sign of death."—P. 78. See our note on Romans ix, 10, 11.

The psychological importance of the heart-center is thus expounded:—

*Accordingly, by means of the soul the spiritual significance of the heart coincides with the bodily.* It is the central seat of the life-blood, the central organ of the body, with a motive force of its own to set agoing the whole circulation of the blood, a propelling force to draw out the vital materials and energies and keep them moving in all directions, and an attractive force to absorb and concentrate the vital streams. It is, therefore, the *center of all active life* in its constant ebb and flow; and it is, consequently, the *workshop of all independent activity and vitality.* Centrality, a spontaneous *concentrated power* to elaborate given materials, a *force* to move and keep in motion the whole *machinery*—these are the three *general* characteristics of the life of the heart. As the soul with all its special *features* is wrought organically into the texture of the blood, so the central chamber of the life-blood, the heart, with all the features we have described, forms *the organic basis of the soul's life as a whole.*—P. 81.

As to the head, we are told that the soul "reaches the utmost height of its influence on the *outward life* in the head and countenance (Deut. xxxiii, 16, 'Let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph;' Prov. iv, 9; x, 6; Eccles. ii, 14; viii, 1; Isa. xxxv, 10;) and especially in the *brain*, in which the organs of sense, forming the means of the soul's intercourse with the outer world, have their center and their apex.* It is here that *such of the soul's perceptive and formative energies as have an outward reference* have their seat and display their functions, as distinguished from those which have an inward, which tend to go ever more and more deeply into the soul, and have their source in its inmost depths. Hence the common distinction between head and heart —that is, between a perception and formative power which has an outward height in the soul, but no access to its depths, and a perception and formative power which has a hold on the depths and secret parts of life. This explains why much comes into the

* Scripture does not directly tell us the importance of the head in relation to spirit and soul; but assumes this in its metaphors, especially when it connects seeing and hearing with functions of the spirit.

outward consciousness that does not come into the inward, and *vice versa*."—P. 26.

Our author holds that men may be divided morally into the regenerate, the righteous, and the wicked; and that for those who have not committed the unpardonable sin there is possible restoration in the intermediate state.

Take a Greek Concordance of the New Testament, and run your eye carefully over the words πνεῦμα and ψυχή, and it becomes very plain that they are words of very different import. God is always a *spirit*, never a *soul;* angels are not *souls*, but *spirits;* the disembodied *spirits* of men are never called souls, except as in the Apocalypse, where a reference is retained to the blood of the martyrs. Take the adjective ψυχικός, *psychical, soulical*, usually but unhappily rendered *natural* in our version, and the case is still more striking. It is the usual antithesis of *spiritual*. So Jude describes the apostates as "psychical, not having pneuma; *pneuma*, without the article, meaning not the Holy Spirit, but *a spiritual nature*. And Heb. iv, 12 speaks of "dividing asunder soul and spirit." See our note 1 Cor. xv, 44.

---

*Concessions of "Liberalists" to Orthodoxy.* By DANIEL DORCHESTER, D.D., 16mo., pp. 343. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. 1878.

Some twenty years since, the American Unitarian Association issued a volume entitled, "Concessions of Trinitarians;" and now, but in no captious, controversial, or retaliative spirit, Dr. Dorchester has gathered from the writings of eminent Liberalists, Unitarian and Universalist, including a few of the extreme school, some remarkable concessions to three of the great doctrines of Evangelical Theology, namely, the Deity of Christ, the Atonement, and Endless Punishment. The field has not before been so well explored, and not a few readers will be surprised at its richness. To have merely exposed the inconsistencies of the writers quoted would have been worth something in the controversy so vigorously waged for the last generation, but Dr. Dorchester has a higher purpose. His fundamental proposition, a concession, indeed, from "The Christian Examiner," is that every great and wide-spread belief, clung to and lived in through a long series of years, and held not only in the minds of scholars but by the great common heart, must be substantially true and needed by the world, however defectively or erroneously it may be stated. And the purpose is to show that, notwithstanding their dogmatic opinions on the questions in hand, these writers, in their better

moods, not casually, but in deliberate discussion, do clearly, repeatedly, and in broad terms, make declarations substantially conceding the truths in these doctrines. Mightier than their logic is the cry of their hearts for a Saviour who is God, and a Redeemer who can cleanse. They do thus really place these doctrines among the universal truths of the race.

The book is prepared with the greatest candor, care being taken to state the opposing views of the several authors quoted in connection with their concessions, thus rigidly doing them full and even justice. It is to be also remarked that these concessions are in all cases selected from writers who, from position or otherwise, stand before the public as the representatives of liberalism.

In the debate on Endless Punishment, the twelve propositions set forth in relation to the philosophical hypothesis of universal restoration cannot fail to be of service. They are logical, clear, and exhaustive, and the concessions under them by such names as Miner, Eliot, Winchester, Dewey, Noyes, Kimball, Bartol, and Hedge, leave little to be said.

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*Opening of the Lewis Brooks' Museum at the University of Virginia, June* 27, 1878. Address on Man's Age in the World. By JAMES C. SOUTHALL, A.M., LL.D., with Introductory Remarks of Hon. A. H. H. STUART, Rector. 12mo., pp. 60. Printed by order of the Board of Visitors, 1878. Richmond, Va.: Clemmit & Jones.

The venerable University of Virginia found a right noble benefactor in Lewis Brooks, a gentleman of Rochester, N. Y. Being an ardent admirer of Jefferson, that gentleman, followed by his heirs, gave nearly a hundred thousand dollars to found a museum for Jefferson's University. In making his donation he concealed his personality from all but Rector Stuart, and after its completion the same telegram announced his death and name to the Virginia public. In the opening commemoration it was held that a memento of mind was more permanent than a monumental marble to their benefactor, and Mr. Southall was called upon to furnish it in the present "Address."

The production was worthy of the occasion. Mr. Southall has furnished about the best brief popular presentation of the subject of Man's Antiquity we have ever read. In view of the disposition of a badly-committed class of overhasty scientists to slight or ignore Mr. Southall's persistent and disturbing exposures, we are

glad Virginia appreciates her distinguished son, and protrudes him so clearly into notice as to demonstrate that he is ignored simply because he cannot be answered. The Address walks over the usual range of topics in a free and graceful style just suited to any one who desires to be posted up with a summary at once readable and reliable.

Though professedly treating Darwinism only incidentally, he presses some arguments against that theory with remarkable force. He makes the geological gaps that separate man from brute, and which cut off genetic connection of various genera from the rest of the paleontological system, yawn with fatal effect. Man is separated by a broad geological gulf from all other animals. It is now admitted that man cannot be descended from the monkey, but claimed that man and monkey are branches from one primitive stem. And yet a gulf not only divides man from all other species, but also divides the monkey from all other species. Monkey as well as man is in isolation. The oldest geological man as yet discovered is without one distinctive monkey trait or degraded quality, as complete a man in body or brain as we often now meet marching along the city pavement. And it is not a mere "missing link" that is wanting, but *a whole chain of links*, to connect man with the branching point where he and monkey divide. And to this chain must also be added the chain connecting the isolated monkey therewith.

The geological breaks in succession of paleontological forms, and that, too, where the strata show no break or disturbance of position, are thus treated.

As regards the monkey:—

> As there is a great gap between the beasts of the field and man, so there is an unbridged gulf between the reptilian forms and the birds of the Secondary Age and the mammals of the Tertiary. Carnivorous and herbivorous mammals, in great numbers, and of many species—and, strangest of all, the monkeys—appear upon the scene at the base of the Tertiary with the most startling abruptness—unheralded, and with no evolutionary trumpet to sound their approach.—P. 21.

As regards fishes:—

> In passing from the Lower to the Upper Silurian and Devonian, the seas suddenly swarm with gigantic and highly-organized fishes. In a moment—in the twinkling of an eye—with no suspicion of a break in the record—we pass at one leap from the mollusks and crustaceans of the Lower Silurians to the sharks and gar-fishes of the Upper Silurian and Devonian. Some of these fishes were from twenty to thirty feet in length, and belonged to a very advanced type of fishes, being allied to the reptilian forms. "It is impossible," says Le Conte, "to overlook the *comparative* suddenness of the appearance of a new class—fishes—and a new department—vertebrates—of the animal kingdom." "Observe," he continues, "that at the horizon of appearance in the Upper Silurian there is no apparent break in the strata, and therefore no evidence of lost record; and yet the ad-

vance is immense. It is impossible to account for this unless we admit paroxysms of evolution, etc."—Pp. 22–23.

As regards trilobites:—

But there is yet another startling apparition in the succession of paleontological forms: if we go back to the Lower Silurian, resting on the Archæan or Eozoic rocks, we find the highly-organized trilobites and cephalopods—heading, as it were, the long succession of animal life. In the Archæan rocks we find only the lowest Protozoan life—the questionable, systemless *Eozoon Canadense;* and with the very dawn of the next era we find "all the great types of structure except the vertebrate." "And these," adds Le Conte, who believes in evolution, "not the lowest of their type, as might have been expected, but already trilobites among the articulata and cephalopods among mollusca—*animals which can hardly be regarded as lower than midway in the animal scale.*—P. 23.

As regards "Paroxysmal Evolution," or Mivartism:—

As the facts now stand, it seems to me impossible to reconcile them with evolution as taught by the disciples of Mr. Darwin in Europe. To evade the difficulty our American evolutionists (in which they were preceded by Mr. St. George Mivart) have invented the theory of *Paroxysmal Evolution*—Evolution by leaps. There was a leap from the plant-like Protozoan to the huge crustaceans with their great many-leused eyes, and to those monster straight-shelled nautili or cuttle-fishes (some of them fifteen feet long) which were the scavengers of the Silurian seas. There was a sudden leap from these crustaceans and mollusks, with no intervening forms, to the monster sharks and gar-fishes of the Devonian. There was a sudden leap from the fish to the amphibian. There was a sudden leap from the great saurians of the Secondary Age to the abounding mammalian life of the Tertiary strata; and finally, by a similar evolutionary paroxysm, some ape-like organism, about the close of the Glacial Epoch—quick as the readjusted crystals of the kaleidoscope—assumed abruptly the human form.—Pp. 23–24.

The old maxim that "nature does nothing by leaps, *per saltum*," is thus paleontologically falsified. Creative or productive nature is a very nimble jumper.

As regards the brachiopods:—

Beginning in the Lower Silurian the sub-class of bivalve shells known as brachiopods (lampshells) has continued to the present day. Of all the genera of animals now having living species only four or five, such as *Lingula* and *Discina*, commenced their existence in the Lower Silurian. These have survived through all the geologic ages, and, with the exception of Dr. Dawson's *Eozoon Canadense*, are among the earliest forms of life now known. They belong to the venerable and persistent tribe of Brachiopods. It occurred to Mr. Darwin that the history of these brachiopods might throw some light on the theory of Evolution. Mr. Davidson, of Brighton, the friend of Mr. Darwin, has made the brachiopods the subject of his life-study. Mr. Darwin accordingly addressed a letter requesting Mr. Davidson to make observations with regard to the brachiopods. The judgment was adverse to the theory. I make the following extract:—

"Darwin's tempting and beautiful theory of descent with modification bears a charm that appears to be almost irresistible, and I would be the last person to assert that it may not represent the actual mode of specific development. It is a far more exalted conception than the idea of constant independent creations; but we are stopped by a number of questions that seem to plunge the conception in a maze of inexplicable, nay, mysterious difficulties; nor has Darwin, as far as I am aware, said how he supposes the first primordial form to have been introduced. The theory is, at best, as far as we can at present perceive, with our imperfect state of knowledge, but half the truth, being well enough in many cases as between species and species; for it is evident that many so-termed species may be

nothing more than modifications produced by descent. It applies, likewise, to accidental variations as between closely allied genera, yet there is much more than this with respect to which the theory seems insufficient. The strange geological persistency of certain types, such as *Lingula*, *Discina*, *Nautilus*, etc., seems also to bar the at present thorough acceptance of such a theory of general descent with modification.—Pp. 55–56.

As regards botany:—

If Mr. Darwin is thus driven away from the animal kingdom by Mr. Davidson, a no less eminent specialist in the department of Botany gives a yet more emphatic verdict against him in that province of life: I refer to Dr. Carruthers, keeper of the Botanical Department of the British Museum. In an address before the Geologists' Association, of which he was then president, at the session of 1876–1877, he says:—

"No doubt there is in the older Palæozoic rocks a great absence of any records of land life. The conditions that permitted the preservation of the fucoids in the Llandovery rocks at Malvern, and of similar cellular organisms elsewhere, were, at least, fitted to preserve some record of the necessarily rich floras, if they had existed, which, through immense ages, led by minute steps to the conifer and monocotyledon of these Palæozoic rocks. The complete absence of such forms, and the sudden and contemporaneous appearance of highly organized and widely separated groups, deprive the hypothesis of genetic evolution of any countenance from the plant record of these ancient rocks. The whole evidence is against evolution, and there is none in favor of it."—P. 57.

The significance of these isolations of system from system is thus forcibly stated:—

If intermediate forms between the trilobite and the fish, or the ape and man, once existed, what has become of them? The missing links, if such there were, must have been considerable in number, and the individuals representing each link in the chain must have existed by tens of thousands and millions. The transitional forms must have been *a hundred times more numerous than the completed type*, and yet we find perfect trilobites and perfect fishes, perfect apes and perfect men, and no trilobites in transitu to fishes, and no apes in transitu to men—although *we ought to meet them at a hundred points*. Where are the intermediate forms between birds and mammals? We ought to find hundreds of these intermediate forms, with imperfectly developed organs; if they existed, there is no reason why we should always miss just these transitional forms, and no others. If we had missed them in one country, we ought to find them in another. The same gaps essentially are reproduced in Europe, Asia, North America, South America, Africa, and Australia. The alleged pedigree of the horse, and such forms as the archæopteryx, and the many similar discoveries which will be made, do not seriously touch this difficulty. The great chasms to which I have referred still remain, and will not be appreciably diminished by these discoveries. If it should be asserted that the silver dollar had been gradually developed by some natural process out of the copper cent, and we should be able to discover only one-cent pieces, two-cent pieces, three-cent pieces, five-cent pieces, ten-cent pieces, quarters, half-dollars, and dollars; and if, moreover, exactly the same pieces, and no others, were found in all parts of the world, the theory would have to be abandoned; because it would be incredible, if the four-cent pieces, the six-cent pieces, the seven-cent pieces, the eight-cent pieces—the thirty-cent pieces, the forty-cent pieces, the seventy-cent pieces, etc.—once existed as transitional links, that we should always miss just these particular pieces, and always find just the others in all parts of the world. Unless we could assign some good reason for the disappearance of all the missing pieces, we should be compelled to conclude that they never existed. In that case, if we still held to the doctrine of evolution, we should have to adopt the paroxysmal evolution of Mivart and Clarence King, and assert that the quarter was developed out of the ten-cent piece by a paroxysmal act, and the dollar out of the half dollar by a yet more violent process.—Pp. 24–25.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*The Story of the Life of Pius IX.* By T. Adolphus Trollope. 2 vols., 8vo. London. 1877.

The history of Pope Pio Nono has been often told. He was the last pontiff who really united in himself ecclesiastical and civil functions; and as his lot fell in "times that try men's souls," his conduct both as a politician and a churchman has been the subject of frequent treatment. Mr. Trollope writes as unbiased as a Protestant may be presumed to write of the head of a system which enslaves in abject superstition a great mass of the western world. But he seems careless as to the facts, and aims at pleasure for the reader at the expense of a higher standard. Those who are not anxious to obtain information in the highest form, and desire nothing more than a bird's eye view of the subject, will prefer this narrator, in which, though it contains no new matter, and is written in a style frequently disfigured by a straining after the melodramatic, the old materials supplied by Italian and French authors, are furnished with considerable skill and set off to full advantage.

Trollope's chapter on "The Pope as a private person" is the dullest in the work. It might have been the best—for there was a humorous side to this Pope's character, and he is credited with many a *bon mot.* Of a Romish diplomatist, whose conduct and professions were at variance, he said: "I do not like these accommodating consciences. If that man's master should order him to put me in jail, he would come on his knees to tell me I must go, and his wife would work me a pair of slippers." A remark addressed to a High-Anglican also will bear repeating: "You remind one of the bells which summon people to church; you ring, but you yourselves keep outside."

One biographer, Gattina, does not scruple to speak in detail of the young Mastai's life while at college, and furnishes a chapter so piquant that we fear the Pope more than once wished the writer of it in purgatory. Mastai was born in 1792. He became the subject of epileptic fits at the age of seventeen. Devout Romanists claim him to have been a pious youth, and this sudden visitation by disease an affliction of Heaven. Gattina, however, and others not of ultramontane disposition, attribute the affliction to a place where pseudo-angels of a lower order congregate. The severity of the disease abated after a time, and by some it is told that this relief came by the laying on of hands of Pope Pius VII. Romanists who would pay special homage to the Virgin Mary claim,

moreover, that it was not the Pope's blessing alone that wrought the miraculous cure, but a vision of the Madonna. It is doubtful, however, if that immaculate lady, with that supernatural power attributed to her, would have thought it respectable to visit him in the circumstances. But whatever the manner, the cure was wrought. After his recovery the formerly gay, accomplished, and coxcombial appearing young man—half soldier, half bourgeois, with a flower in his buttonhole and a pipe in his mouth, given over to adventures and love affairs—was suddenly transformed into a religious devotee. Mastai was ordained, and became a popular preacher. "No acrobat or prima donna was ever so successful at the famous fair at Sinigaglia, the Vanity Fair of the clerical aspirant. The women were enthusiastic. Marianne Simonelli had a tropical passion for the young Mastai. La Ferretti, a St. Thérése, *less* the mysticism, predicted for him, among other good things, the papacy." Gattina has probably made the most of all the extravagant talk that circulated in Mastai's youth. And he has forgotten to tell how all Rome was delighted with the remarkable displays of oratory and religious passion of the young priest Mastai, and how not only women, but strong-minded men too, became weak before him, so earnest was he in preaching the terrors of future penalty. He was particularly brilliant in his *fervorim*—short, impassioned discourses—such as one may hear at Rome during holy week at the *Gesu*. He even simulated purgatorial flames by plunging his hands in burning spirits.

A new era dawned on Mastai Ferretti in 1829. The priest then changed into a prelate. Spoleto needed an archbishop. The political agitation was great throughout Italy. The approach of the disturbances which crowded the year 1830 was manifest in a thousand ways. The ecclesiastics, in order to be all-powerful and sufficient for the struggle, needed more than ordinary experience. A policy of anxious, irritated, and at the same time irritating, repression had proved a failure. Mastai Ferretti was young enough to avoid falling into this error of his seniors, and as he had gained much political sagacity in his semi-politico-religious mission across the sea, he was selected for the vacant archiepiscopal chair. He quickly perceived that he must abandon the old receipts of the prison and the executioner, and by a wise rule he maintained perfect order in the midst of general disturbance. While all Italy was in arms, the little archbishopric of mountainous Spoleto remained peaceful. The only ripple on the surface was the sudden incursion of 5,000 insurgents, who came there to seek refuge from the

pursuing Austrians. He dealt so kindly and judiciously with them that he induced them to lay down their arms and submit to authority. And when the civil government of the city submitted to him the lists of these insurgents, he tossed them into the fire, instead of forwarding them to Rome.

How well the Pope appreciated Mastai is made apparent in his selection, a short time after, as apostolic nuncio to Naples; and he so ably discharged this mission that he was honored with the cardinalate by secret conclave in 1839, though he did not receive the purple robe until the year after. He was yet comparatively a young man. There were many far his seniors in the college of cardinals. Certainly no one dreamed that the bestowal of the red hat upon Mastai Ferretti was likely to bring him the tiara soon.

In 1846 Gregory XVI. died. The conclave which met was largely composed of men raised to their dignity by the deceased pope. There were only fifty of them, and many of these had never been present at a papal election. The choice lay virtually between Lambruschini, the representative of the old system, and Bianchi, a moderate liberal, who, it was hoped, would find a way of satisfying the national aspirations without encroaching on the domain of the Church. But *without* the conclave there was an enthusiastic faction called "Young Italy" resolved to have a liberal Pope, one who would espouse the Italian cause as a patriot and not as a mere ecclesiastical prince. They fastened upon Mastai Ferretti. He was known to them as a patriotic Italian. Had he not stood by the Revolutionists while at Spoleto? No one outside of the conclave imagined, when on the 14th of June it convened, that the person at whose simple mention the "holy" men were accustomed to cross themselves would be successful. The only help was in the popular enthusiasm, which ran so high that there was hope the *vox populi* might possibly be turned into the *vox Dei*. The mutilated Pasquin on the second morning gave forth this oracle:—

> If God elects we shall have Bianchi;
> If the people elect we shall have Ferretti;
> If the devil elects we shall have Lambruschini.

On the very first vote Lambruschini had received only fifteen votes and Mastai thirteen. On the afternoon of the 16th the fourth ballot was cast for Mastai thirty-six times—making, of the fifty-two who were present, more than the necessary two thirds—when the assembly rose as one man to confirm the choice by unanimous acclamation. Young Italy had conquered against all

the Jesuit machinations. But it was well that it was done so soon; for as Mastai—now Pius IX.—was bestowing his benediction (*Urbi et orbi*) from the balcony of St. Peter's, an Austrian cardinal drove into the Piazza, with smoking post-horses and a "veto" from Vienna.

A month after the liberal *regime* was ushered in with the proclamation of an amnesty. There was universal enthusiasm and a lively expectation of benefits to come.

His reforms were, in reality, of little value. The best of them —those devoid of any political significance—projects to regulate the finances, to reform the administration of justice, to introduce railways, to ameliorate the condition of the Campagna—brought about merely a temporary improvement. The political measures were equally short-lived in their results, and, besides, were a burlesque on liberalism. Thus in March, 1847, an edict of the press was published, with the intention of removing some of the restrictions under which it had labored till then; but strong hints were given as to the subjects which the Government would allow to be discussed, and a censorship remained established in full force. The same year witnessed the institution of the *Consulta*, under the presidency of Gizzi. This seemed like concession to popular demands, but the whole thing was a farce; the members were chosen by the Pope, and the functions of the council of the most limited nature. Its duty was to give an opinion when called upon, leaving it to the Pope to act upon the proffered advice or to do otherwise. In 1848 appeared the famous *statuto* creating a high council and a chamber of deputies—as the triumph of constitutionalism. But the chambers were forbidden to propose any law on ecclesiastical or mixed affairs, and every measure had to be submitted to the Pope in a *secret* consistory, with the absolute right of veto. It is, therefore, scarcely surprising that no one outside the principal States believed in the Pope's capabilities as a political reformer, or in his desire to see his reforms carried into effect.

Then comes the story of Pio Nono's extraordinary hegira to Gaeta, which was forced upon him by an exasperated and deluded people that had trusted in his professions of liberalism to learn only at last that the Church of Rome places her own interests first, last, and always.

When Italia finally gained her full liberty, in spite of all Jesuit machinations, Pio Nono is shut up within the walls of the Vatican, lest his love for Victor Emanuel should lead him to abandon his temporal crown; and in order that the world might not under-

stand the game, it is trumpeted about that a cruel Italian Government abandons its Pope and appropriates to itself the provisions of the Church of Rome! J. H. W.

---

*Our South American Cousins.* By WILLIAM TAYLOR, author of "Seven Years' Street Preaching in San Francisco," "Christian Adventures in South Africa," "Four Years' Campaign in India," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 318. New York: Nelson & Phillips. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1878.

This little volume is a charcoal sketch by our bold evangelist of an exploring tour made by him along the sea-coast cities of western South America. He left New York last October, finished his winter work, and re-appeared to Gotham in May. He went by steam to Aspinwall, crossed the Isthmus, and thence took steam for Callao, Peru. He extended his course by sea, stopping at the principal coast cities of Peru and Chili, which countries stretch their long length between the Andes and the ocean, forming the spine of our southern continent. He visited, among others, Lima, Copiapo, Coquimbo, and Valparaiso, not stopping until he had reached Concepcion, where Patagonia begins to form the continental tail. The object of our spontaneous and rapid evangelist was to plant Churches and ministers at all accessible spots on that line. He soon found, however, that though Churches and preachers were much desired, yet schools and teachers were more in demand, and he shaped his policy for both purposes, so as to furnish teachers who could also be preachers. At each important place he drew up a subscription pledging support for the proper man, by him to be sent, requiring it to be signed not by one or two munificent patrons in large sums, but by numbers in lesser sums, on the ground that even the small subscriber would feel that the concern in which he had invested was a concern in which he was interested. On his return he was able to report that in six months he had traveled eleven thousand miles, had opened twelve centers of educational and evangelizing work, to which he was ready to appoint eighteen earnest workers, twelve male and six female. He went to the Boston University, appointed Alexander P. Stowell his "recruiting sergeant," and soon filled his corps with material able in his estimation to stand fire, even if it be the fire of martyrdom. It is a cheering omen that he was so soon able to find the right sort of stuff in one of our schools of the prophets. After securing due authentication for his preachers from the authorities of our Church, he has returned to his providential field of labors, cheered thus far by success, and entertaining a full but not fanatical faith that it was the gracious Spirit that opened his

path and spread his programme before him. Brother Taylor is a man of heroic mold, to whose intuitive eye things often reveal aspects not patent to ordinary retinas, and for whom red tape must prove a little elastic. His intuitions may, perhaps, be sometimes too impulsive, but years of trial have proved how truly his whole being is consecrated to Christ, and how with his whole energy he presses forward to fulfill his task while the day lasts. He does not, like Paul, work at tent-making to earn his own livelihood that he may cheaply preach a priceless gospel, but *he writes books;* and whoso buys his book pays a little tribute to our evangelist at the same time that he learns to sympathize with his work.

---

*That Boy: Who Shall Have Him?* By Rev. W. H. Daniels, A. M., Author of "D. L. Moody and his Work," etc. 12mo., pp. 434. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1878.

The readers of the "National Repository" will recognize this as the serial story whose several parts have greeted them from month to month in the pages of that publication. The aim of the author, as avowed in the preface, is to show the effect of the peculiar doctrines of Calvin on warm, positive, passionate natures. The boy's mother, loving her dead husband and dead infant, hates, with all the strength of her desolate soul, the theological figment of a God who, she is told, would send them both to hell for the sin of Adam. Her hatred of this Calvinistic God is so strongly reproduced in her son that he resists for years his religious convictions, and yields only when he sees that the God of the Bible is not the embodiment of almighty self-will, as he has been represented, but a tender Father as well as a just Judge.

The story is told in strong language, and the characters are vividly drawn. We cannot help admiring the intense earnestness of the strong-willed mother, the gentle and helpful son, and the saintly elder, with his peaceful face and patriarchal halo of silver hairs. In the description of a "liberal" Church, with a Shakspearean club instead of a weekly prayer-meeting, and of the "Mons Sacer School," which is "a den of theological lions, with sharp teeth and savage claws," many a sharp blow is given by the author at the follies and weaknesses of human nature. But, while he shows himself so quick to discern, and so skillful to strike at, the errors of others, he seems to reveal one of his in the unmistakable vein of superstition which runs through one of his best characters, with no hint of his disapproval. Still, we commend the book as a good stirring story, well written, full of thought and provocation of thought.

*Between the Gates.* By BENJAMIN F. TAYLOR. Author of "Songs of Yesterday," "Old Time Pictures," "World on Wheels." "Camp and Field," etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 292. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1878.

"Once upon a time," as the story-books say, the author of this book journeyed across the continent from Chicago to San Francisco. The usual route of tourists was followed, omitting Salt Lake and the Mormons. The author tells us of the plains, the mountains, San Francisco street scenes, the "hoodlums," the Chinese, with their opium, their grotesque theaters, and strange ways generally, the seals, the United States Mint, the Geysers, the petrified trees and Yosemite, Southern California, with its "city of Angels," its vineyards, orange groves, bee ranches, and old mission buildings, and then we suddenly find the author at home again, with no very clear idea of the way in which he got there.

These various places and things, with the incidents of the journey, are described in a style which defies description. As we attempt it, we think of a kaleidoscope, a poet with "his eyes in fine frenzy rolling," and a mild case of *delirium tremens*. The woods storm the mountains, the mountains stab the skies, the precipice swoons down to the plain, and all nature, usually called inanimate, canters up and down the scene in crazy ecstasy. The book is a hurricane of rhetorical wind, a meteoric shower of brilliant nothings, which will amuse, and perhaps please, any careless reader who has no Gradgrind curiosity in regard to facts.

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Grundriss der biblischen Hermeneutik.* (Outlines of the Science of Bible Interpretation.) Von Dr. J. P. LANGE. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

What Dr. Lange did in his encyclopedia for the whole of theology, he here does for a single branch. A single glance at the classification of the matter of the book suffices to show its wide scope and its thoroughness. After an "apology" for the science of interpretation, there follows a comprehensive introduction. This is followed by the general subject. Among the themes discussed are—the divine phase of the Bible, the human phase, and the theanthropic phase; the principles of interpretation, the historical development of these principles; interpretation according to the analogy of faith, also according to the analogy of Scripture; the idea of interpretation; the purpose of interpretation; the method of interpretation; the relative imperfection of all interpretation.

As a sample of the matter of this book, take what the author says on interpreting Scripture by Scripture: It results from the very idea of the Bible, that it is a self-interpreter, (*habet facultatem semetipsam interpretandi.*) Thus, each writer is to be interpreted by himself, by synonymous expressions, by related antitheses; then, by analogous or diverse expressions of other writers; Old Testament texts by New, and the converse; didactic passages by historical, and conversely; obscure passages, by the plain. Even as the whole vitality of the body comes to the help of a single member when endangered, so the whole body of Scripture is to be summoned in to rescue a single text, when in its isolation it refuses to reflect a harmonious sense. First of all, the exact literal sense of a passage must be reached; the exegete must beware of sermonizing his own thoughts into the text; he must simply reflect what he finds. In comparing sacred eloquence and poesy with profane, it must always be remembered that with the former the eloquence of form is merely secondary, whereas with the latter it is primary.

In regard to the present unsatisfactory state of exegetical science Dr. Lange makes liberal concessions. The Bible *must* be interpreted; and yet its interpreters are sometimes its worst enemies. Only too often they have obeyed the sarcastic advice of Goethe:—

> "Im Auslegen, seid frisch und munter!
> Legt ihr's nicht aus, so legt was unter."

A chief blunder of exegesis has ever been a too frequent using of literal texts as formal dogmas. In some cases it has also shown a deplorable desperateness in defending the literal historical actuality of certain narratives, (Balaam's ass, Joshua's still-standing sun, the story of Jonah, the bodily presence of Satan in the temptation of the wilderness,) from no better motive than that thus only could the official doctrine of inspiration be safeguarded. In the hands of some, the literal sense is made to deify the written letter; in the hands of others, it is made to sink this letter below the prosiest of human prose.

The whole drift of this brief, compact work of Dr. Lange is eminently healthy and evangelical. To him the Bible is a positive source of instruction. He invites the Church to go to it, not merely to confirm its preconvinced doctrines, nor merely to complement the teaching of its own intuitions, nor merely to find a feeble increment to the bright light of an ever-present inspiration of the Spirit, but as to the primary and fundamental and ever-during *chief source* of religious and ethical truth.

*Die Anlage des Menschen zur Religion vom Gegenwärtigen Standpunkte der Völkerkunde aus betrachtet und untersucht.* Von JULIUS HAPPEL. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn.

This book, though not written by an author of long established reputation, is of great value, and is the fruit of much reflection. It treats of man's natural or innate capacity for religion, and of the light which modern scientific research has thrown upon the outward manifestations of this capacity, under the various forms of civilization, past and present. The work falls into five chapters. The doctrinal position of the author is the mild orthodoxy of Rothe. The method of the work is, to state the several positions insisted on, and then to illustrate and prove them by historical and scientific facts brought together from a wide range of the best modern authorities. In the course of the work the whole field of mythology, history, psychology, and the philosophy of religion is laid under contribution. The first chapter (pp. 110) treats of the actuality of man's innate endowment for religion. The second (pp. 71) considers the various objects toward which this capacity has developed itself: God, the world, the heavenly orbs, the forces of nature, the creations of our fears or passions, plants, animals, mere symbols, fetiches, etc. The third (pp. 76) discusses the quality of the religious life to which man's innate capacity has given rise, specifying these four stages: the sensuous, the materialized, the moral, the normal religious. The fourth (pp. 67) gives a sound statement of the relation of religion to morality, holding essentially the ground of Wuttke in his "Christian Ethics," namely, that true morality is not possible without religion, and that the two are but different phases of the same thing. The last chapter (pp. 66) depicts the circle of evolution through which man's tendency to religion usually manifests itself, and shows clearly man's need of being helped by a formal objective revelation. The subject-matter with which these chapters are filled out is well worth the attention of all true students of anthropology and religion. Its study would result in a much more intelligent view of the non-Christian religions than only too generally prevails. It comes as near to furnishing a satisfactory "philosophy of idolatry" as any work within our knowledge. It is, of course, quite easy and simple to say, "The heathen worship stocks and stones;" but the way in which this is usually understood is about as shallow as it is simple. The fact is, there lies at the basis of even the lowest paganism an immense gulf of dark mystery and of dread seriousness. And any true comprehension of the subject will awaken deep compassion,

rather than self-complacent contempt, for the deluded victims. We therefore commend the work of Pastor Happel. It is popular and easy in style, and is elegantly printed in Latin type.

---

*Die Beziehungen der Ueberordnung, Nebenordnung und Unterordnung Zwischen Kirche und Staat.* (The Relations of Church and State.) Von Dr. W. MARTENS. Stuttgart: Cotta.

Dr. Martens endeavors to discuss his delicate theme in an objective and unpartisan manner. And his book will be helpful to the champions of either of the variant views on the general subject. He passes in review and criticises each of these four views: 1. The *hierocratic* system; 2. the *State Church* system; 3. the *protectorate* system; 4. the purely *secular* system. In the first, the State and Church are identified; all civil law has religious sanction, and is but the application of religion to life. In the second, the Church is a mere creature of the State, and has no real autonomy or dignity. In the third, the State is of general Christian character, recognizing the fundamentals of religion, and extending to a plurality of Churches an equal *patronage*. In the fourth, the State confines itself to protecting the material interests of its subjects, and permits the religious consciousness to manifest itself in whatever manner it will, guarding each from the objective encroachments of the others. The second and the third views the author opposes. And he rightly insists that the hierocratic and the secular systems are the only ones that are self-consistent. But, strangely enough, he does not decide positively for either of these two as against the others, but argues for some sort of commingling of both. It is but another instance of the correct theorizing but blundering practice of the average old-world scholar. Happily for us, these scholarly bewilderments from across the seas serve greatly to confirm our faith in the wisdom of the State system devised for us by our fathers. For see: Are not we a Christian people? Yes; by the great majority. Ought not our laws to be Christian laws? Yes; they ought to harmonize with Christian truth. How are we to become a more thoroughly Christian nation? Let the Churches imbue the people with vital religion. Ought we not to incorporate some degree of Christian dogmas into our National Constitution? This could do to religion no good, and it might do to it much harm. It would point toward the blunder which Constantine committed. And it would tempt the Church to *lean upon the State*. A great misfortune! Religion prospers most when it is *let alone*, and when it leans upon nothing but God and itself.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*Probate Confiscation.* By Mrs. J. W. STOW, Author and Lecturer. Third edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. 400. Printed and sold by the Author. 1878.

It seems that Mr. J. W. Stow was a business gentleman in San Francisco, highly esteemed in community, and of large estate. While his wife was traveling in Europe he died, and, although an affectionate husband, appointed executors without placing his wife as one among them. The Probate Court took the estate in hand with great efficiency. On her return she found the entire property in the hands of a large body of appropriators, such as executors, court lawyers, and other legal functionaries, who in due time divided it legally and artistically among themselves. The law took the entire oyster, and left her we cannot say how much of a shell. The agony of this injustice seems to have quickened her blood, and she writes with no little talent, and a decidedly fiery pen. Her book is lively reading. She proposes, practically, a scheme of law which shall herein right the wrongs of widows. To her Memorial to the Massachusetts Legislature are affixed the names of Charles Francis Adams, Marshall P. Wilder, L. Maria Child, R. W. Emerson, W. Lloyd Garrison, Henry W. Longfellow, and other gentlemen of high standing.

It is passing strange that oppressive laws should still rest upon the weaker half of our race. Strange that they should be incorporated into a new code, as in California. Strange, also, that old enlightened Massachusetts should retain them for a moment after the case is fully presented, sustained with fair argument and illustrious names. It does so happen that of every man the mother, the sister, the wife, is a woman; and the right-hearted man feels a wrong done to said woman more acutely than a wrong done to himself. And yet it is upon mothers, sisters, wives, that these wrongs are by men inflicted. Yet law may be, and perhaps sometimes is, as hard upon husband as upon wife.

*The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice.* By ALFRED CAVE, B.A. 8vo., pp. 524. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1877.

*Lectures on Mediæval Church History.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D. 8vo., pp. 444. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1878.

*St. John's Gospel Described and Explained According to its Peculiar Character.* By CHRISTOPH ERNST LUTHARDT. Translated by Caspar René Gregory. Vol. III. 8vo., pp. 390. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1878.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin.* By Rev. J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D. Translated by William L. R. Cates. Vol. VIII. Large 12mo., pp. 464. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1879.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews.* With Notes. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. Large 12mo., pp. 244. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

*Predestination and Freewill and the Westminster Confession of Faith.* With Explanation of Romans ix, and Appendix of Christ's Preaching to "The Spirits in Prison." By JOHN FORBES, D.D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 116. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. 1878.

*Home Lessons on the Old Paths;* or, Conversations on the Shorter Catechism. By M. T. S. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1879.

*The Expositor.* July and August, 1878. Edited by Rev SAMUEL COX. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

*Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* Spring Conferences of 1878. 8vo., pp. 179. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

*Tent Work in Palestine.* By CLAUDE REIGNIER CONDER, R.E. In two vols. 8vo. Vol. I., pp. 381; Vol. II., pp. 352. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

*Through the Dark Continent,* etc. By HENRY M. STANLEY. Two vols. 8vo. Vol. I., pp. 522. Vol. II., pp. 566. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The Voyage of the "Challenger."* The Atlantic. By Sir C. WYVILLE THOMPSON. In two vols. 8vo. Vol. I., pp. 391; Vol. II., pp. 340. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*The Students' French Grammar.* By CHARLES HERON WALL. Large 12mo., pp. 458. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Science for the School and Family.* Part I., Natural Philosophy. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M.D. Large 12mo., pp. 433. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Popular Astronomy.* By SIMON NEWCOMB, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 566. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

HARPER'S HALF-HOUR SERIES: *Oliver Goldsmith, John Bunyan, Madame D'Arblay.* By LORD MACAULAY. 32mo., pp. 139.—*Squire Paul.* By HANS WARRING. Translated by MARY A. ROBINSON. 32mo., pp. 184.

FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY: *Kingsdene.* By Hon. Mrs. FETHERSTONHAUGH.—*Twenty Years' Residence Among the People of Turkey.* By a Consul's Daughter and Wife.—*The Russians of To-day.* By the Author of "The Member for Paris," etc.—*Paul Knox, Pitman.* By JOHN BERWICK HARWOOD.—*Henriette.* Fragments from the Diary of the Marquis de Boisguerny. By ERNEST DAUDET.—*Christine Brownlee's Ordeal.* By MARY PATRICK.—*The Young Duke.* By BENJAMIN DISRAELI. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Vick's Illustrated Monthly Magazine.* August, 1878. Rochester, N. Y.

*Mag.* A Story of To-day. 4to., pp. 122 New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Kilrogan Cottage.* A Novel. By MATILDA DESPARD. 8vo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Colonel Dunwoddie, Millionaire.* A Story of To-day. 4to., pp. 187.

*Sir Walter Scott.* By RICHARD H. HUTTON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

*Gibbon.* By JAMES COTTER MORRISON, M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1878.

# INDEX.


Adams: Bishop Baker.....Page 111
Africa and the Africans..... 723
Age of Bronze, The..... 563
A Golden Christmas..... 195
A Jewel of a Girl..... 388
Allen: The Elevation of a Race and the Redemption of a Continent..... 579
American Cath. Quar. Review. 141, 337, 695, 715
American Politics, The Problem of..... 291
Americans in Turkey, The..... 388
A Modern Minister..... 195
Arnold: Daniel Webster..... 659
Arnold: Education among the Freedmen... 43
Arnot, Rev. Wm., Autobiography of..... 192
"Atonement" of the Early Church no Price Paid to Satan..... 504
Early notions concerning the rights of the devil..... 504
Teaching of Irenæus..... 507
Views of Origen..... 512
" Gregory of Nyssa..... 515
" Gregory of Nazianzen..... 518
" John of Damascus..... 519
" the Latin Church..... 520

Baird: Schliemann's Trojan Researches ... 496
Baker, Bishop..... 111
His youth, conversion, and studies..... 112
As a teacher.....114, 117
As a preacher..... 115
As a theological professor..... 118
Elected to the episcopacy ..... 119
Baptist Quarterly ..... 143
Barrass: Case and his Contemporaries..... 448
Barrows: Distinctive Feature of Methodism 194
Beck: Outlines of Biblical Psychology..... 743
Beecher: History of Opinions on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution ..... 388, 536
Benjamin: Contemporary Art in Europe .. 187
Bennett: A History of Methodism, for our Young People ..... 387
Bible Wines ..... 490
Is alcoholic wine mentioned in Scripture with approval?..... 490
The vine a highly esteemed production of the Holy Land ..... 496
Fermented wine not the sole product of the vine ..... 497
Original words translated wine..... 498
Nazarite law required abstinence from the products of the vine ..... 499
Bibliotheca Sacra ..... 142, 337, 695, 715
Binney: The People's Commentary ..... 388
Bishops' Address to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, The ..... 575
Black: Green Pastures and Piccadilly.. 388, 580
Black: In Silk Attire..... 195
Blue Law Forgeries of Rev. Samuel Peters. 67
Early settlers in New Haven ..... 68
Their attention to education..... 71
Their treatment of the Indians..... 73
Their wise slowness in adopting a code of laws..... 74
Their wise choice of officers..... 77
The "Blue Laws" of Peters' Forgeries... 79
Boswell: Tyerman's Life of Whitefield.... 491

Bowen: Modern Philosophy from Descartes to Schopenhauer and Hartmann... Page 556
Bowman: Silence of Women in the Churches 388
Bowra: A Young Wife's Story..... 195
Boys' Pocket Library, The..... 194
Braddon: An Open Verdict..... 580
Braun: The Religious and Moral Views of Adam Smith..... 342
Brine: Bessie, the Cash Girl..... 387
British and Foreign Evangelical Review ..... 142, 340, 717
British Quarterly Review .... 142, 338, 540, 717
Bryant: Sermons on the Atonement and Baptism..... 580
Buddhism According to the Chinese Canon 586

Calvin and Servetus..... 149
Calvinistic Dogma of Original Sin ..... 147
Cameron: Deceivers Ever ..... 580
Carroll: Case and his Contemporaries..... 448
Carroll: City Methodism .... ..... 27
Case and his Contemporaries..... 448
Names of Canadian pioneers ..... 449
Early preachers ..... 450
Hardships..... 451
Conference organizations ..... 453
Work among the Indians ..... 454
Canadian Methodists and unification..... 456
Early educational facilities provided ..... 459
Experimental preaching ..... 460
Cass: Is There a Hell?..... 580
Castelar, Religious Views of..... 544
Cave: The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice. 768
Charlesworth: The Old Looking-Glass. 388, 580
Chinese Problem, Some Phases of the ..... 268
Christian Perfection and the Higher Life .. 698
Points of agreement..... 699
Wesley's views..... 692
Illustrations ..... 698
Instincts of human nature not to be rooted out..... 695
Difference of views ..... 696
Do the Scriptures teach complete deliverance from depravity?..... 701
The Lord's Prayer and freedom from sin. 708
Scripture teaching on the subject..... 712
Christian Recorder, The..... 390
Church: Epochs of Modern History..... 388
Church Extension Annual, including the Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Church Extension of the M. E. Church 579
Church: Stories from Homer..... 580
Cicero's Tusculan Disputations, etc..... 580
City Methodism..... 27
Is Methodism in cities a failure?..... 29
Statistics of city and country Methodism. 33
Peculiar difficulties..... 35
Relative progress in Chicago..... 37
In New York city..... 38
Question of probationers considered..... 39
Clarke: Essentials and Non-essentials in Religion ..... 354
Clark: Summer Rambles in Europe..... 188
Colonel Dunwoddie, Millionaire ..... 764
Conder: Tent Work in Palestine..... 764
Congregational Quarterly..... 525
Contemporary Review..... 337

Cowles: The Epistles to the Hebrews..Page 764
Craik: Two Tales of Married Life..... 888
Crane, J. T.: The Two Circuits..... 190
Crane, J. L.: Christian Perfection and the Higher Life ..... 688
Crowned Victors ..... 571
Curtiss: The Levitical Priests ..... 344

Daniels: That Boy: Who Shall Have Him? 758
D'Aubigné: History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin..... 768
Dawson: The Origin of the World, According to Revelation and Science ..... 367
Decheul: Character and History of the Old Christian Sibyls ..... 727
De Leon: The Khedive's Egypt ..... 195
Delff: Prometheus, Dionysos, Sokrates, Christos ..... 332
De Mille: The Elements of Rhetoric ..... 572
De Pressensé: The Early Years of Christianity ..... 362
De Puy: Methodist Statistics ..... 311
De Puy: Statistics of the M. E. Church in the United States ..... 576
Despard: Kilrogan Cottage ..... 764
Deuteronomy, The Book of ..... 340
Di Cesnola: Cyprus ..... 373
Dickson: Beauty for Ashes. ..... 560
Dix: Why a Catholic in the Nineteenth Century? ..... 367
Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, The ..... 389
The Discipline much changed ..... 390
Doctrines not changeable ..... 391
Early style of the Discipline ..... 392
Changes in the Wesleyan Minutes..... 393
Our Discipline Wesleyan..... 396
Theory and functions of the episcopacy.. 397
The presiding eldership ..... 400
The pastoral term ..... 403
Our Church Government compared with that of the Republic ..... 409
Dorchester: Concessions of "Liberalists" to Orthodoxy ..... 748
Drouven: Die Reformation in der Kölnischen Kirchenprovinz ..... 577
Dühring: Der Werth des Lebens..... 386
Dykes: Abraham, the Friend of God ..... 182

Edinburgh Review..... 158, 337, 527, 717
Education Among the Freedmen..... 43
Jefferson's views..... 44
Prompt activity of the Churches for the benefit of the freedmen ..... 46
Freedmen's schools in 1863 and 1864 .... 48
" " 1865 and 1866 .... 49
District of Columbia's Schools..... 50
Work of the American Missionary Society 53
Schools of higher instruction..... 56
Fisk University..... 59
Present status of freedmen..... 65
Egyptian Chronology.....197, 462
A difficult problem..... 197
Monumental records and their use..... 198
The historical documents and their value. 202
The disagreements, and their probable causes..... 206
Manetho's numbers not trustworthy..... 218
Probable reconstruction..... 462
The "Hycsos" and the Israelites..... 471
Synchronisms. ..... 476
El Evangelista, Organo de la Verdad Evangélica en el Rio de La Plata ..... 382
Elliott: A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures..... 556
Evertebusch: Das Vaterunser..... 385
Expositor, The.....195, 579, 764

Farrar: Eternal Hope..... 359
Finley: Elsie's Children..... 196

Fisher: The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the World at the Birth of Christ.....Page 179
Florida New Yorker, The..... 378
Forbes: Predestination and Freewill and the Westminster Confession of Faith.. 764
Foreign Literary Intelligence.....168, 351, 555
Denmark ..... 352
France.....169, 555
Germany.....168, 351
Italy..... 555
Foreign Religious Intelligence..168, 347, 547, 734
Mohammedanism ..... 347
Old Catholics..... 166
Religious statistics of Asia..... 734
The Roman Catholic Church..... 547
Fox: Plagiarism and the Law of Quotation. 548
Franklin Square Library.....560, 764
Frazer's Magazine..... 728
French Protestantism, Discussion of..... 732
Froude: Short Studies on Great Subjects.. 195
Fuller: Our Southern Field ..... 219
Future Punishment.....323, 396

Gass: The Origin of Monasticism..... 161
Gebhardt: The Doctrine of the Apocalypse, and its Relations to the Doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John..... 788
Goodwin: The Duty of Literary Men..... 560
Green: History of the English People..375, 560
Grundlehner: Johannes Damascenus..... 578
Gypsies, Origin and Wanderings of the.... 717

Halstead: The Future Religious Policy of America..... 185
Hamlin: Among the Turks..... 189
Happel: Die Anlage des Menschen zur Religion vom Gegenwärtigen Standpunkte der Völkerkunde aus betrachtet und untersucht..... 761
Harpers' Greek and Latin Texts.....337, 579
Harpers' Half-Hour Series.....338, 560, 764
Haven: The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church ..... 389
Hawels: The Art of Beauty ..... 574
Hegel, The Development of the Idea of Religion in the School of..... 548
Hemenway: Bible Wines..... 490
Hill: The Principles of Rhetoric and their Application..... 573
Holly: Modern Dwellings in Town and Country ..... 560
Home Lessons on the Old Paths..... 764
Hooker: Science for the School and Family 764
Huber: Die Forschung Nach der Materie.. 386
Hugo: The History of a Crime..... 560
Hutton: Sir Walter Scott..... 764
Huxley: A Manual of the Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals..... 387
Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church 361

Idiocy and Imbecility..... 154
Illustrated Historical Sketches..... 194
Immer: Hermeneutics of the New Testament 184
Indian Evangelical Review..... 155
Islam..... 5
The founder of Islam..... 7
Mohammed a deceiver..... 9
An assassin ..... 10
A polygamist..... 11
The Koran lowers the character of God.. 13
Teaches fate—upholds slavery..... 14
Panders to lust..... 15
Teaches conquest by the sword..... 16
The effects of Islam on the world..... 18
Israelites in Egypt, The..... 344

Jacobus: The Christian's Heritage, and other Sermons..... 560
Justine's Lovers..... 560

Kennedy: The School and the Family. Page 580
Kingsley, Charles: All Saints' Day, and Other Sermons. 388
Kingsley, W. L.: The Blue Law Forgeries of Rev. Samuel Peters. 67
Kokle, on Luther. 728
Kramer: Theorie und Erfahrung. 857

Lacroix: The New Ethics. 631
Lange: Grundriss der biblischen Hermeneutik. 759
Latimer: Mysticism. 412
Lecky: A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 376
Lefort: Intempérance et Misère. 386
Lewis, Tayler: In Memoriam. 604
Graduates at Union College. 605
Fills a professorship in the University of New York. 606
Accepts chair of Greek in Union College. 606
Writes his "Six Days of Creation". 606
His biblical studies and research. 607
His work as a commentator. 608
His crowning work. 610
His deafness. 612
Incidents. 615
His antislavery convictions. 616
Among his books. 620
Dr. Lewis a member of the Bible Revision Committee. 624
His religious faith. 625
His decease and funeral. 629
London Quar'y Review (Lond.) 149, 327, 527, 717
London Quarterly Review, (N. Y.). 148, 327, 527
Luthardt: St. John's Gospel Described and Explained According to its Peculiar Character. 768
Lutheran Quarterly. 141, 327, 525, 715

Macduff: Brighter than the Sun. 192
Madame De Staël's "Germany". 561
The authoress an original and profound thinker. 562
The "Allemagne" a book of genius. 563
The author's exile. 564
Her opposition to Napoleon. 566
She completes the work. 591
Again persecuted, but inflexible. 592
Her flight to London. 595
Her work at last secure for the press. 596
Scope, purpose, and success of the work. 597
Mag. 764
Martens: Die Beziehungen der Ueberordnung, Nebenordnung und Unterordnung Zwischen Kirche und Staat. 769
Marvin: A Series of Lectures on Transubstantiation and Other Errors of the Papacy. 570
Marvin: Doctrinal Integrity of Methodism. 560
Matheson: Growth of the Spirit of Christianity from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. 191
Mayer: Scientific Discoveries and Religious Views. 780
Methodist Episcopal Church, The Doctrines and Discipline of. 389
Methodist Statistics. 311
Early methods of Methodist statistics. 311
Comparative value of our statistics. 312
Annual conferences, bishops. 315
Itinerant preachers. 316
Ministerial service. 317
Local preachers. 318
Losses by death. 319
Our colored work. 320
German Methodism. 321
Our work in the South. 322
Growth of lay membership—Strength of the M. E. Church by States. 323
Actual and relative progress. 325

Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Acts of the Apostles. Page 366
Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Matthew. 366
Miller: The Kirkwood Library. 194
M'Ilvaine: The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament. 142
Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church. 388, 764
Missionary Education. 156
Monasticism, The Origin of. 159, 161
Morrison: Gibbon. 764
Mysticism. 412
The spiritual world a reality. 413
Objective point of mysticism. 414
Value of the study of mysticism. 416
Mysticism of great practical interest. 421
Mystic revival needed. 425

Newcomb: Popular Astronomy. 764
New Englander. 327, 716
New England Historical and Genealogical Register. 327, 525, 715
New Ethics, The. 631
Based on Arminian principles. 632
Relation of body and soul. 633
Human freedom. 634
The fall of man. 644
Nature of moral law in man. 645
The moral motive. 646
Newton: Little and Wise. 194
Newton: The King in his Beauty. 560
Nicholson: The Ancient Life—History of the Earth. 372
Non-Denominational Gospel Mission to the Prisoners of the Tombs of New York. 560
North American Review. 145, 336, 525

Oliphant: Carita. 195
Oliphant: Young Musgrave. 388
Our Children's Songs. 195

Parton: Caricature and Other Comic Art in All Times and Many Lands. 567
Patrick: Marjorie Bruce's Lovers. 195
Payn: Less Black than We're Painted. 560
Payn: What He Cost Her. 195
Peck's Address to the Ministerial Candidates of the Southern Illinois Conference. 177
Perry: Esther Pennefather. 560
Peters: General History of Connecticut, etc. 67
Peters: The True Blue Laws of Connecticut and New Haven, and the False Blue Laws Invented by Rev. Samuel Peters. 67
Pettingell: Homiletical Index. 368
Pettingell: The Theological Trilemma. 742
Philo, the Jew. 121
Alexandria founded. 122
Jews at Alexandria find an outlet of commercial enterprise. 125
Story of the Septuagint. 127
The apocryphal books. 130
Philo's birth and early life. 137
His great attainments in learning. 138
Contemporary with New Testament events. 139
Phœbus: Was Wesley Ordained a Bishop by Erasmus? 88
Pictures from Our Portfolio. 194
Pitman: Alcohol and the State. 193
Plagiarism and the Law of Quotation. 648
Definitions of plagiarism. 649
Obligations to preceding writers not incompatible with originality. 652
Unconscious reminiscences. 653
Various degrees of literary larceny. 654
Losses attributed to plagiarism. 656
Powell: State Regulation of Vice. 388
Prime: Pottery and Porcelain of all Times and Nations. 196

Problem of American Politics, The.....Page 291
Early American politics..... 293
System of import duties established ..... 297
Doctrine of State rights..... 299
The great war for the Union ..... 301
The liquor question a disturbing element 306
Also the encroachments of Romanism... 304
Danger in universal suffrage ..... 307
Protestantism in France ..... 545
Puller: School History of Rome, etc... 568, 579

Ragey: Sainte Anselme au Bec..... 366
Randles: Substitution, a Treatise on the Atonement ..... 357
Religious Education of the Colored People of the South..... 716
Revue Chretienne..... 344, 544, 732
Richmond: Problem of American Politics. 291
Roe: A Knight of the Nineteenth Century. 194

Saphir: The Hidden Life..... 181
Schaff: The Creeds of Christendom, etc... 170
Schliemann's Trojan Researches..... 426
His youth and early studies..... 429
Excavations of Troy..... 433
Site of Homeric Troy..... 437
Thickness of deposits no basis for chronological data—Civilization not a sufficient index of age ..... 438
Deposits prove a steady decadence..... 439
The real discoveries ..... 444
Satisfactory results ..... 446
Scott: Islam..... 5
Shakspeare's History of King Henry V.... 679
Shedd: Theological Essays ..... 184
Sheldon: "Atonement" of the Early Church no Price paid to Satan..... 504
Shields: The Final Philosophy..... 185
Silence of Women in the Churches..... 238
Teaching of Scripture on the question... 239
Pre-eminence of man..... 241
Why women may be prophets and not teachers..... 242
Woman's social status in New Testament times..... 244
Exegesis of Scripture, "Let your women keep silence," etc..... 249
Paul allows women to speak ..... 260
The Spirit poured out upon "all flesh".. 261
Skepticism in Geology..... 527
Smith, Jun., G. G.: The History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida ..... 577
Smith, H. B.: Faith and Philosophy..... 356
Smyth: The Religious Feeling..... 365
Socialism and Social Reforms in Germany. 730
Some Phases of the Chinese Problem..... 268
Dr. Townsend's book described..... 270
Dr. Gibson's book..... 271
Exclusiveness of the Chinese..... 272
Question of large or small immigration.. 275
Influence of opium-eating..... 278
The religious condition of the Chinese... 284
Ample room here for Chinese..... 285
Introduction of a large heathen element. 287
Southall: Opening of the Lewis Brooks' Museum at the University of Virginia. 749
Southall: The Epoch of the Mammoth, and the Apparition of Man upon the Earth. 568
Southern Field, Our..... 219
Early spread of Methodism in the South. 219
The Southern Church still claims the field. 221
The South financially poor..... 223
Her educational condition deplorable.... 225
Her numerous Evangelical Churches.... 227
The colored people especially need us.... 228
The present strength of the M. E. Church in the South ..... 230
Our work there must continue..... 232
Southern Herald, The..... 378
Southern Question, The..... 145
Southern Review, The...Page 147, 327, 525, 715
Sozinskey: Personal Appearance and the Culture of Beauty..... 195
Spofford: Art Decoration applied to Furniture..... 195
Stanley: Through the Dark Continent..... 764
Stevens: Madame De Staël's Germany.... 561
Stirling: A True Man ..... 388
Stow: Probate Confiscation..... 768
Stratton: Through a Needle's Eye..... 388
Strong: Egyptian Chronology.....197, 462
Sumner, Charles ..... 540

Taylor, B. F.: Between the Gates..... 759
Taylor, Wm.: Our South American Cousins 757
Theological Medium.....327, 525
Theologische Literaturzeitung..... 577
Theologische Studien und Kritiken. 156, 342, 730
The Wreck of the "Grosvenor"..... 388
Thompson: The Prayer-Meeting and its Improvement..... 580
Thomson: The Voyage of the "Challenger" 764
Todd: Some Phases of the Chinese Problem. 268
Townsend: The Protestant Queen of Navarre, the Mother of the Bourbons..... 194
Trench: Medieval Church History ..... 768
Trollope: The Story of the Life of Pius IX. 758
Trowbridge: Book of Gold, and other Poems 195
Tyerman's Life of Whitefield ..... 491
Whitefield's early life..... 491
Entrance upon his ministry—His power. 493
One of the greatest of orators ..... 495
Courage in his sermons..... 498
His freedom from bigotry..... 499
Industry and power of endurance..... 502
His last sermon and death ..... 508

Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths ..... 158
Universalism..... 526
Universalist Quarterly ..... 142, 337, 526, 715

Vick's Illustrated Monthly Magazine ..... 764
Vogt: Frementhätigkeit und Christenthum 384

Wall: The Students' French Grammar.... 764
Was Wesley Ordained a Bishop by Erasmus? 88
Letter of Bishop Peters of Vermont..... 88
Wesley an advocate of episcopal ordination 98
Assumes the functions of a bishop in 1784 98
Claimed the sole power to act as a bishop 100
His proposition to Fletcher and the answer 101
Wesley based his right to ordain on the ground of episcopal prerogative ..... 105
How was he constituted bishop?..... 109
Watson: That Review Article ..... 172
Webster, Daniel..... 659
His early life and studies..... 660
Admitted to the bar ..... 662
His contest with Hayne ..... 665
Rapid growth as a statesman..... 666
The Ashburton Treaty..... 669
His speech on the settlement of New England at Plymouth Rock..... 671
Takes new ground on slavery..... 674
Seeks Southern support and breaks down 678
Charges of immorality ..... 680
His religious views..... 682
Estimate of his abilities..... 686
Weingarten: On the Origin of Monasticism 159
Wells: Taylor Lewis: In Memoriam..... 604
Wesley as a Greek Bishop ..... 195
Westminster Review ..... 154, 337, 526, 717
Williams: Lectures on Baptist History .... 188
Winchell: Adamites and Pre-Adamites.... 564
Woolsey: Political Science..... 561
Worman: Philo, the Jew..... 121

Zahn on Eusebius and Hegesippus ..... 162
Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte..... 161, 727
Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft, Theologie..159, 543